



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

win
#/8
~~200~~

~~7.00~~
1.50

HORÆ EVANGELICÆ.

PROPERTY OF LIBRARY
NORTHEASTERN COLLEGIATE BIBLE INSTITUTE

226
B536h

HORÆ EVANGELICÆ:

OR,

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

BEING AN INQUIRY INTO THE
STRUCTURE AND ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS,
AND THE
CHARACTERISTIC DESIGN OF EACH
NARRATIVE.

BY THE REV. T. R. BIRKS, M.A.,

LATE KNIGHTBRIDGE PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY, CAMBRIDGE, AND
HONORARY CANON OF ELY.

EDITED BY THE REV. H. A. BIRKS, M.A.,

CURATE OF CHIGWELL, ESSEX, LATE SCHOLAR OF
TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:

GEORGE BELL & SONS, YORK ST., COVENT GARDEN
AND NEW YORK.

1892.

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

PROPERTY OF LIBRARY
NORTHEASTERN COLLEGIATE BIBLE INSTITUTE

CHISWICK PRESS:—CHARLES WHITTINGHAM AND CO., TOOKS COURT,
CHANCERY LANE.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

IN republishing, at my mother's request, a portion of my father's "*Horæ Evangelicæ*," I trust that I am doing a real service to the cause of sound Biblical criticism. The question of the origin of the Four Gospels, with which it deals, must always remain one of surpassing literary interest, and it is one that has never yet obtained a full and satisfactory solution. I feel assured that the work here submitted to the public is an important contribution to the elucidation of the subject, though it has hitherto failed to obtain the measure of attention it deserved.

It was first issued in the year 1851, shortly after the appearance of Strauss' "*Leben Jesu*," in its English translation. It came from the obscure country rectory of Kelshall, and at a date before my father's reputation as a theologian was thoroughly established. His earlier works had chiefly been upon the subject of prophecy, a subject that appeals to a comparatively narrow audience. The success of the book was also hindered, partly by its great length (550 post octavo pages), but far more by the most imperfect manner in which it was passed through the press. The course of reasoning is clear and simple, but there was little outward help afforded to the reader: there was no index, no table of contents; misprints were numerous; authorities were quoted without reference, and the Greek quotations appeared at times with accents and at times without. Hence it has long been out of print, and though it is quoted with approval in Bishop Wordsworth's well-known "*Commentary*," and is referred to in Dean Alford's later "*Prolegomena*," it is but seldom quoted in more recent works, and seems to have left but little per-

manent impression. Shortly before my father's last illness his thoughts had turned a good deal to the subject, and he had made some beginnings of revision with a view to republication ; but other calls continually interfered, until the hand of God cut short his toil. Since his death more than one request has come from those who knew and valued the work for some re-issue of it, either in whole or in part.

It is with great diffidence that I now take the work in hand. My own previous studies have little fitted me to do it justice ; at every point I feel the unavailing longing to consult the first author. There is one consideration that somewhat cheers me. Four years' experience of teaching in a theological college has given me some little practice in placing the thoughts of others clearly before men of average intelligence. So here and there, where my father seems to me to have taken too much knowledge for granted in some of his readers, I have ventured to supply some missing link. With this trifling exception, I have very rarely ventured on any alteration of the text, beyond correction of obvious misprints. Omissions and additions are noted in their place. I am indebted to my brother, the Rev. E. B. Birks, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, for supplying me with many references to the ancient fathers ; and to my former private tutor, Dr. Sinker, the Librarian of Trinity College, for kindly reading the greater portion of my notes, and giving me wise counsel and encouragement.

The general view of the subject maintained in the following treatise is not, as I am well aware, the one at present most in vogue. The principal points maintained are these :—

1st, that the order of the evangelists is that of our present bibles, St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John.

2nd, that each writer wrote with a reference to those that had preceded him.

3rd, that from a careful examination of the chronology of the Acts, approximate dates may be assigned to the several authors.

And 4th, that each writer had a special class of hearers in view, a special purpose in his composition, a special aspect of the One Life to bring into new prominence.

The fourth point would now be generally admitted, although my father's treatment is fresh and vigorous. The other three are, I think, opposed to the main drift of current popular opinion. I only claim a patient hearing.

I was myself trained at Cambridge in the view of a traditional oral gospel, so ably expounded in Bishop Westcott's "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels." To the greater part of the views there expressed I find no difficulty in yielding an ungrudging assent. But the author himself admits that all difficulties are not removed by the hypothesis of a traditional oral gospel alone. And he appears to me, though here I speak with great caution, somewhat to misapprehend the position of those who uphold the interdependence of the gospels one upon the other. To me it seems that my father's views and his own are, in the main, at least easily reconcilable. According to my father, twelve years from the Ascension passed before the earliest record of our Lord's life upon the earth was committed to writing. In that busy period there is already time for oral teaching, and the experience obtained in it, to have effected an immense work in sifting the innumerable incidents of the Lord's ministry, and fixing upon those that were most typical and representative and valuable to be chronicled for every after age. Still, much latitude must have remained even in the choice of incidents, and in the treatment of individual incidents much greater latitude. For the tradition had twelve fountains, and not one alone; there were twelve independent witnesses, for many separate incidents far more than twelve. It seems to give us too artificial a view of the apostolic oral teaching, if we suppose that the twelve apostles met to consult as to the precise terms and phraseology in which the several instructions should be given. It is true that the verbal coincidences are greatest, as we should naturally expect them to be, where the actual words of our Lord and others are recorded: but they are often very striking in the connecting narrative as well; too

striking, to my mind, to be accounted for by any simple theory of oral tradition.

So much for the difficulties of the oral theory, standing alone. And now a word or two about misapprehensions concerning the theory of mutual interdependence. The nature of this mutual relationship is often most painfully misunderstood. The evangelists are really almost represented as though they had sat down, armed with a pair of scissors and a paste-pot, to frame new gospels out of those that had preceded them. Nothing could be more opposed to the spontaneity of that early age; nothing more foreign to the literary spirit of the early writers. It is quite possible to suppose that one evangelist had a close, even a familiar, acquaintance with the work of his predecessors, without supposing that he kept it open all the time that he wrote. Beside the earlier MSS. there was the still more prevalent and widely current tradition and beside the tradition there was the evangelist's own personal knowledge, a fresh and ever-flowing fountain. It is absurd to think of them as trammelled, though it is almost demonstrable that they were influenced by those who had preceded them.

But, it is asked, why should they create difficulties and permit discrepancies, which, had they known the work of the preceding evangelists, they might have easily avoided? Surely they did not think about it. Theirs was an age of faith. They wrote for believers, and not for the outside world; they wrote, in the full consciousness of their sincerity, for those who were prepared to trust them; they wrote, each one of them, in perfect freedom from his own especial point of view. We cannot picture them as sitting down and questioning at every sentence, How will this strike posterity? How will this stand the microscopic analyzing of the coming critic? They would never, without direct divine compulsion, have had the courage to begin their work at all—strangers as they were to literary effort—had they foreseen with any clearness the minute verbal scrutiny to which their writing would be subject. They wrote for the need of the moment, with no eye to posterity, with no thought of the critics; and their sincerity has proved the best warrant

of permanence, and their simplicity has touched the heart of each successive generation more than the most consummate and elaborate art. It was all but certain that each in turn should be, consciously or unconsciously, in greater or less degree, influenced by those who had already written; it was all but impossible that any one could be degraded to the level of a common plagiarist, a mere worker with scissors and with paste. If this were adequately borne in mind, it would remove most (certainly) of the objections brought forward against the theory of mutual dependence, most even of those which are advanced in Bishop Westcott's "Introduction." The oral gospel, we may well admit, was the main source of common information in the early church, but this does not preclude the possibility, nay, I would even say the likelihood, that each evangelist was cognizant of those who were before him. The possibility is patent to all; the likelihood, I think, will be established in the pages following.

It is fashionable now to dwell very largely upon the fragmentary character of the gospels, and to disparage the labour of the harmonist. We have memoirs, not annals, and dates are thought to be of small account. Now it seems to me that there is a good side and a bad side to this state of opinion. It is good (and it is a lesson which Bishop Westcott has been pre-eminently successful in enforcing) to recognize with clearness the limitations of our knowledge, to wait with patience for a fuller light; not to imagine that we must harmonize everything, and clear up every difficulty, or else the truth has failed. There may be many missing links in knowledge that, till the judgment day, when knowledge shall be no more merely in part, we may be quite unable to supply, and in our patience we must win our souls. We may recognize the spiritual unity of conception in each individual gospel, and the diverse aspects of the one great character that all of them declare. We may do this, although we are unable to reconcile seeming discrepancies of circumstance or of chronology; and the tendency of modern thought is to set aside as mere laborious trifling the effort to construct a system of chronology, and

to dwell with emphasis upon the broader and more spiritual truths.

I think it will be found in the ensuing pages that the larger and broader aspects of the question are not left out of sight: and yet there may be real advantage, if we duly recognize essential limitations, in trying to piece together, as nearly as may be, in chronological succession the fragments of the record handed down to us. Surely the notes of time recorded were, in the Providence of God, intended to encourage such attempts: the result of honest labour bestowed upon the subject will be a clearer and more definite conception of the outline of the Pattern life. This harmonist and that may here and there have strained a point unduly in the desire to arrive at something definite; but let us not, in hasty revulsion of feeling, leap to the unadvised conclusion that no point can be gained, and that it is lost labour to attempt it. There is a danger on one side of not daring to stop short of absolute precision; there is, I think, a danger no less real upon the other of acquiescing with too much contentment in a brilliant and luminous haze.

I do feel confident that those who will take the pains to study these early labours of my father's ripe manhood carefully, whether or no they can assent to all his arguments, will find some mists removed and some fresh light upon a subject that ever must remain of deepest interest. I will conclude by quoting some words of Dr. Salmon in his recent "Introduction to the New Testament," in which I find encouragement.

"My reluctance to enter with you upon this inquiry arises solely from my sense of its extreme difficulty For if I wished to deter you from forming any theory as to the origin of the gospels, and to persuade you that knowledge on this subject is now unattainable by man, I should only have to make a list for you of the discordant results arrived at by a number of able and ingenious men who have given much study to the subject.

"Yet patient and careful thought has so often gained unexpected victories, that we incur the reproach of indolent cowardice if we too easily abandon problems as insoluble.

In particular we ought not to grudge our labour when it is on God's word we are asked to bestow our study. It is scarcely creditable to Christians that, in recent years, far more pains have been expended on the minute study of the New Testament writings by those who recognize in them no divine element, than by those who believe in their inspiration." (Lect. ix. part 2, p. 129.)

So far Professor Salmon. He is encouraging, for though the inquiry is difficult, and calls for close attention and hard thought, he tells us that it is not hopeless, and my father's work at least does something to remove the discredit to Christians of which he speaks. I feel it a great privilege, in the humbler task of editing this book, to be allowed in any way to share my father's labours and bring his thoughts again before the notice of the world. I wish the task had fallen to more worthy hands.

καλὸν τὸ ἄθλον, καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς μεγάλη.

THE TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Editor's Preface	v
Author's Preface (1879)	xxiii

BOOK I.

THE MUTUAL RELATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

CHAPTER I. THE SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY.

External evidence of authorship and date of gospels.—Internal evidence.—Three leading views of origin of gospels—(1) Common documents; (2) Oral tradition; (3) Mutual succession.—The measure of support accorded to the several views.—The third adopted in the present work.—The method of inquiry.—Comparative analysis from the Baptism of John p. 1

CHAPTER II. ON THE RELATION OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK.

Four subjects of comparison.—Selection of events.—Arrangement of events.—*Resemblance* of historical details.—*Distinctive* phraseology p. 11
 Result. St. Mark, with independent knowledge of his own, has made use of St. Matthew, restoring the true order of chronology.

CHAPTER III. ON THE CHRONOLOGICAL REGULARITY OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

Brief summary of varied views about the relative date, the origin, and regularity of Luke's gospel.—Its regularity maintained from the internal evidence—(1) The preface; (2) Analogy of Book of Acts; (3) The main divisions; (4) The special notes of time; (5) The regularity of chapters iii.-ix. 50; (6) The regularity of chapters xviii. 15-xxiv.; (7) The regularity of chapters ix. 51-xviii. 14.—Note by the Editor p. 31
 Result. St. Luke has written in orderly succession.

CHAPTER IV. THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN
BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. THE GENERAL ARGUMENTS.

Various views.—Griesbach's untenable.—St. Mark no compilation of St. Matthew and St. Luke.—Olshausen's untenable.—St. Luke is wholly later than St. Mark.—St. Luke is also later than St. Matthew—(1) The words of the preface probably refer to the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark; (2) St. Luke's fuller account of our Lord's infancy no valid argument of his priority; (3) The comparative development of the early ministry in Matthew; (4) St. Matthew's fulness of doctrinal discourse; (5) St. Matthew's record of the Resurrection; (6) St. Luke's account of the Ascension no proof of his priority p. 49

CHAPTER V. THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN
BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. THE FIRST YEAR OF THE PUBLIC
MINISTRY.

The double object of each successive gospel to supplement and to confirm the witness of the earlier, explains the complex character of their resemblances.—The gospels compared in detail in order to establish their relative priority.—The Baptism of John.—The Baptism of Jesus.—The Temptation.—The opening of the Ministry.—The call of the Four (not the same event as the Miraculous Draught, Luke v.).—The Dispossession in Capernaum.—The cures upon the Sabbath.—The cure of the Leper.—The Paralytic.—The call of Matthew.—The Discourse at the Feast p. 62

CHAPTER VI. THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN
BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. FROM THE SECOND PASSOVER TO
THE TRANSFIGURATION.

I. St. Luke vi. 1-18—(α) The Cornfields; (β) The Withered Hand; (γ) The Healing of the Multitude and Ordination of the Twelve. II. St. Luke vi. 19-49—Compared with the Sermon on the Mount.—The two are not identical.—St. Luke the later writer. III. St. Luke vii.—(α) Centurion's Servant; (β) Message of the Baptist; (γ) The parts peculiar to St. Luke. IV. St. Luke viii. 1-21—From the appointment of the Twelve to the teaching by parables. V. St. Luke viii. 22-56—(α) The Storm; (β) The Demoniac; (γ) The Ruler's Daughter. VI. St. Luke ix. 1-50—(α) Visit to Nazareth omitted; (β) Commission of the Twelve; (γ) The Alarm of Herod; (δ) The Five Thousand; (ε) Events peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Mark; (ζ) Peter's Confession; (θ) The Transfiguration; (η) The Dispossession and instructions following. p. 92

CHAPTER VII. THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. THE LAST CIRCUIT AND JOURNEYINGS.

The section peculiar to St. Luke contains many sayings that correspond with those in St. Matthew.—Analysis of section, with parallels from Matthew.—These are no proof of Luke's irregularity.—Similar sayings are repeated in the same gospel.—The nature of the ministry involved such repetitions.—St. Luke's selection of these sayings admits of explanation.—They are adapted to the context in each place.—Three test cases—(1) The caution to his would-be followers (ix. 57); (2) The Lord's Prayer (xi. 2-4); (3) Exorcism and signs, xi. 14-35.—Sayings omitted by St. Luke on first occurrence to be inserted afterwards.—An instance in the message of the Baptist.—The title "Lord" recurring in this section a mark of Luke's later date.—Its rare use in St. John no argument to the contrary.—St. Luke gained information from the seventy.—[Note by the Editor upon Professor Salmon's introduction.—The independence of St. Matthew and St. Luke is not assured] . p. 131

CHAPTER VIII. THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. THE CLOSING SECTION, CHAPTERS XVIII. 14-XXIV.

From the length of the inquiry three incidents selected—(1) The Ruler's Question; (2) The Cure of the Blind Men at Jericho. Note by the Editor. (3) The Money cast into the Treasury . p. 174
Result of the inquiry. The order is that in which the present gospels stand; each later writer knew the earlier, and each had independent information.

CHAPTER IX. THE HISTORICAL RELATIONS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The law of witnesses applied to the four gospels.—The fourth is no mere doctrinal supplement, but has important historical relations to the other three.—(1) It gives the Judæan Ministry; (2) Supplies the interval from the close of the Temptation to the Public Ministry in Galilee, i. 19-iv. 43; (3) The Feast, St. John v., nearly coincident with narrative, St. Luke vi. 1; (4) The miracle of the Five Thousand supplies a fresh coincidence; (5) Light thrown in chapters viii.-x. on the Peræan Ministry; (6) St. John's account of the Raising of Lazarus has links with earlier gospels; and (7) His account of the Resurrection of our Lord confirms the earlier gospels p. 180

APPENDIX—Containing a short summary of the Author's views upon the subject of the gospel chronology, with a list of approximate dates p. 189

BOOK II.

THE CHRONOLOGY, AUTHORSHIP, AND DATE OF THE
BOOK OF ACTS, TOGETHER WITH THE DATES AND
AUTHORSHIP OF THE THREE EARLY GOSPELS.

INTRODUCTION.

The nature of the argument.—Assuming (from Book I.) that the three gospels are successive, it is attempted first to determine the chronology and date of the Book of Acts; and (2) to determine successively the place to be assigned in the history to the gospels of St. Luke, St. Mark, and St. Matthew.—The fourth gospel omitted from this inquiry p. 195

CHAPTER I. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

Need of inquiry.—Limiting periods of history.—Date of Ascension, A.D. 30.—Dates of the Roman emperors.—Their bearing on the history.—Death of Herod Agrippa I., A.D. 44, the most definite mark of time.—Greswell wrong in assigning it to A.D. 43.—The “fourteen years” of Gal. ii. 1 date from St. Paul’s conversion, close with the Council at Jerusalem; are probably current, not complete.—But how many preceded Herod’s death?—The martyrdom of Stephen (from state of Jewish politics) probably A.D. 36.—The rest of the churches, Acts ix. 31, due to the claim of Caius Caligula to divine honours at Jerusalem, A.D. 40.—Hence the conversion of St. Paul most probably in A.D. 37.—Burton’s chronology untenable.—Arrangement of events to Passover of A.D. 44.—The stay at Tarsus.—The stay at Antioch.—The visit to Jerusalem.—Arrangements of events to Council.—The missionary circuit probably lasted from spring, A.D. 45, to autumn, A.D. 47.—The long stay at Antioch means more than a whole year.—So far, from A.D. 48-51 is possible for Council.—The date of Roman governors will fix it further.—Appointment of Felix, A.D. 52.—Removal of Felix.—Reasons for placing it at A.D. 55 shown to be insufficient.—Reasons for placing it in A.D. 60.—Arrangement of events in Acts from Council at Jerusalem to Paul’s release from Rome.—Subsidiary notes of time—(1) The decree of Claudius; (2) Appointment of Gallio to Greece; (3) The salutation of Narcissus’ household, Rom. xvi. 11; (4) The date of the Egyptian; (5) The high-priesthood of Ananias; (6) The prefecture of Burrhus.—Table of results p. 197

CHAPTER II. THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

The book the work of a companion of St. Paul.—Timothy had no part in its composition.—Internal evidence agrees with all tradition in assigning it to none but Luke.—Its date.—It could not have been finished earlier than A.D. 63.—The last two verses a brief supplement.—The time of Paul's imprisonment a favourable opportunity for such a work.—If it was written later why is there no mention of any later events?—The description of Gaza as desert no argument for later date.—Perhaps the first twenty-six chapters composed at Cæsarea, A.D. 58-60.—Theophilus certainly no inhabitant of Palestine, possibly of Italy, of Greece, or Syrian Antioch.—Reasons against his residence at Rome.—And for his residence at Antioch.—All notices of place and persons favour it.—St. Luke himself a resident of Antioch.—Seems to have left St. Paul towards the close of first imprisonment at Rome.—His name not mentioned in Philippians.—Had he returned to Antioch, and there completed "Acts," before the news of Paul's release arrived, A.D. 63?—The three first gospels written in gradual succession earlier, and correspond with three marked periods of history and centres of activity 235

CHAPTER III. THE DATE AND PLACE OF WRITING OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

The gospel was written at some interval before the Acts.—The reference, 1 Tim. v. 18, implies a date not later than A.D. 57.—The phrase, 2 Cor. viii. 18, "the brother whose praise is in the gospel," refers to Luke.—And in his character as author of a written gospel.—Hence by comparison with Acts, we conjecture the gospel was written by Luke at Antioch about A.D. 51, before he joined St. Paul at Troas.—The Council at Jerusalem would emphasize the need for such a work.—The long stay of Luke at Philippi would favour its dissemination.—Internal evidence falls in well with this date and place.—The preface.—The allusions to Herod's household.—The mention of the Galilæans slain at the Passover.—The allusion to the census, St. Luke ii. 1.—The key to the interpretation of this disputed verse found in the fact that the great census of Cyrenius was a familiar era in the town of Antioch . . . 252

CHAPTER IV. ON THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

The gospel universally assigned to Mark, the companion of Peter, by most identified with John Mark the evangelist.—Various dates assigned to it.—Allusions in Acts and Epistles favour the claim of John Mark as evangelist.—A brief *resumée* of his history as given

in the Bible.—The date and object of St. Peter's first epistle; its object to confirm the teaching of St. Paul, its bearer Silas, its date about A.D. 58.—The probable, though unrecorded, movements of St. Mark.—Connection of St. Peter and St. Mark apparent in the gospel.—Tradition that the gospel was first published at Rome supported by the alleged Latinisms, and the mention of "Alexander and Rufus."—Yet it is plainly written for residents in Palestine, assuming in its readers a general acquaintance with the customs and land of the Jews.—Therefore written for Gentiles in Palestine by a companion of St. Peter.—The history in Acts accords with this.—The gospel composed about A.D. 48 for Roman military residents at Cæsarea.—Hence the tradition of its Roman origin.—Concluding arguments.—Connection of St. Mark and St. Luke in Holy Scripture.—Transition character of gospel accords with history of Mark, its writer.—His failure at Perga would not disqualify him for this work.—His name suggests descent from Roman Jew.—Allusions favouring an early date of writing and a special knowledge of Jerusalem in the writer.—Would St. Paul have turned back Mark at Antioch (Acts xv.) had he been then the writer of a gospel?—Objection met 269

CHAPTER V. THE DATE AND AUTHENTICITY OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

Historic probability points to a date about A.D. 42.—External evidence conflicting.—Internal evidence points to an early origin.—The mention of the Baptist.—The use of the word *ἡγέμων*.—The phrase "unto this day."—The mountain in Galilee where Jesus had appointed them.—The use of the term "gospel."—The designation of the Twelve.—Titles of honour for Jerusalem.—The sons of Zebedee and other notices.—The partial chronological irregularity.—Minute allusions to incidents and places as familiar.—The character of the quotations.—The mention of Herodians.—Brief summary of the argument and concluding coincidence 292

CHAPTER VI. ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GREEK GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

The early date assigned to Matthew's gospel establishes its authenticity.—Internal evidence confirms it.—The question of the language difficult.—Tradition widely current that he wrote in Hebrew.—What weight must be assigned to this external evidence?—Papias proved in error on another point.—Eusebius and Origen are not consistent.—The circumstances of the church, analogies from other books, and the internal evidence favour a Greek original.—Internal evidence.—The mode of introduction of Hebrew

terms.—The quotations.—The titles of our Lord.—The Latinisms.—*ἐπιόντιος*.—Tradition in itself is liable to error, and in the present case is contrary to probability.—St. Matthew may have written a Hebrew gospel earlier, but it is little likely 309

APPENDIX. THE AUTHOR'S LATER MS.

Introduction.—The problem stated.—The belief in Hebrew origin probably far from universal even before the Reformation.—Division of opinion since.—Dean Alford's change of view.—The Author's earlier change.—Opinions of Tregelles and Roberts . . . 321

CHAPTER I. ON THE WEIGHT DUE TO EARLY TRADITION.

Resumée of ancient evidence.—Papias.—Irenæus.—Origen.—Eusebius.—Pantænus.—Epiphanius.—Jerome.—Claim to a catholic consent.—Reasons for caution in accepting the tradition.—The testimony of the inscription in all known copies of St. Matthew has weight upon the other side.—The false tradition of St. John's immortality.—The false tradition current through the soldiers at the tomb.—The tradition of the Hebrew gospel in one respect *less* trustworthy, for it was not contemporary.—All three combine a nucleus of truth with partial error.—The error of Papias, due to a natural inference from an acknowledged fact, leads to eleven consequences hard to be believed.—Hence his statements questioned by a majority of recent critics.—Is the authority of Matthew's gospel threatened? No, for we must distinguish parts in the examination of all ancient evidence 325

CHAPTER II. THE APOCRYPHAL HEBREW GOSPEL.

Break in the MS.—Papias removed in time and place and epoch from the Palestine of Matthew's days.—Made a mistake about its language.—Hebrew, the special language of Judea, would more accord with John, the gospel of Judean ministry.—The notion of a double Matthew a source of fresh perplexity in an already complicated problem.—The alleged diverse interpretations of the Aramaic gospel may be resolved into diverse, and, for the most part, Judaizing Aramaic renderings of Matthew's original Greek 333

BOOK III.

ON THE IDEALITY OF THE GOSPELS, OR THE CHARACTERISTIC DESIGN OF EACH OF THE FOUR NARRATIVES.

CHAPTER I. ON THE SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

The gospels show spiritual distinctness and mutual harmony as messages of truth from God.—Associated from early antiquity with the four cherubic symbols.—The gospel of St. Matthew pictures Christ the law-giver and righteous king, the lion of the tribe of Judah.—This is apparent throughout.—The genealogy.—The infancy and opening ministry.—The notices of prophecy.—The Sermon on the Mount.—The series of miracles.—The apostolic commission.—The series of parables.—The entire structure of the irregular section.—The stater in the fish's mouth.—The parables of judgment.—The story of the risen Lord.—Brief summary 338

CHAPTER II. ON THE DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

Summary of outward relationships of Mark.—Distinctive spiritual character.—He pictures Christ a pattern of laborious diligence in present duty.—The sparing introduction of discourse.—Abrupt commencement with the active ministry.—The use of the imperfect tense and adverb *ἐνθίω*.—The many graphical details.—The special names and phrases.—The notices of gesture and deportment.—The two distinctive miracles.—The three incidents common to Mark and Luke alone.—The record of the Resurrection.—The closing words 351

CHAPTER III. THE SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

St. Luke the gospel of Christ's human sympathies; presents him as the great high priest.—Opens with temple scene.—Distinctive features in narrative of infancy and opening ministry.—The frequent mention of Jesus as a worshipper.—As a physician.—In his intercourse with women.—The parables have a domestic character.—Our Lord is set before us in all social intercourse.—The gospel ends as it began, with proclamation of a universal hope, and worship in the temple courts.—Brief summary.—St. Luke especially the missionary's gospel. 363

CHAPTER IV. THE TRUTH AND DIVINITY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

St. John's gospel, from its late date and deep theology, more open than the rest to the assault of philosophic doubt.—It proves itself to be of apostolic authorship, the work of John.—It bears many traces of being the work of an eye-witness of the scenes described.—It throws light on the whole chronology.—And shows familiarity with various localities.—Is most precise in its allusions to the apostolic company.—Has frequent notices of number, time, and place.—And bears a plainly supplementary relation to the three earlier evangelists.—Concluding summary 373

INDEX 395

AUTHOR'S HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

(From an imperfect MS. of 1879.)

THE “*Horæ Evangelicæ*,” which I published in 1851, was occasioned by the recent appearance of the English translation of Strauss’s “*Life of Jesus*” in 1846.

The work was designed as a contribution to the historical evidence of Christianity, and to throw a fuller light on the mutual relation of the Four Gospels—the special design and origin of each, and their Spiritual features as a divine Revelation.

The “*Horæ Paulinæ*,” to which I prepared a supplement under the title “*Horæ Apostolicæ*,” first suggested the idea of such a treatise. The “*Horæ Evangelicæ*” was designed to extend the argument from internal evidence, applied by Paley with such ability to the Book of Acts and St. Paul’s Epistles, to the Histories in the Four Canonical Gospels. The nature of the subject, however, required a wholly different mode of development. The principle of Undesigned Coincidence, which Paley unfolds, needed to be replaced by another, the principle of Reconcilable Variation. Four narratives of the same life, very similar in their structure and ranging over the same period of thirty-five years, had to be compared in order to detect the causes of their agreement or disagreement, and thereby to establish the genuineness of each narrative, and the substantial truth of the whole history.

It was needful to enter fully on difficult questions which have been long debated and variously solved, with regard to the origin, the mutual connection or independence, and the historical harmony of the gospel narratives.

The notoriety of Dr. Strauss’s work, its wider influence

abroad, and the appearance of the English translation in 1846, gave a further importance to this inquiry. Several of the answers by foreign writers were based on a lax view of the gospels, both of their inspiration and historical accuracy, which did not prevail to the same extent among the Christians of our own land. However alien the mythical theory may be from the common sense of the British mind, it is never safe for poison to circulate without an antidote being provided. The same line of inquiry which best refutes this form of unbelief leads also to conclusions of great historical interest and of practical value to the Christian student. I thought that the results to which it had led me would be a help and confirmation to the faith of many.

The whole subject was arranged in four books.

The First inquired into the mutual relations of the four gospels, so as to establish their order of succession and historical connection by the internal evidence alone. The result thus obtained was in entire agreement with the current of early tradition.

The Second Book investigated the chronology of the Book of Acts, the probable date of the gospels, and the evidence of their authenticity.

The Third Book examined the chief contradictions alleged to exist between them, and showed that they supply for the most part fresh evidences of their common veracity.¹

The Fourth Book entered on a higher field, and briefly treated of the gospels in their ideal, as a divine revelation, with a special reference to their miraculous character, the alleged fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies, and the great doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Resurrection.

The view of the Gospel Harmony which I sought to

¹ This third book, being a detailed criticism of the objections in Strauss's work—objections often answered since—has been omitted in this republication; and also the first three chapters of Book IV., which touched on wider questions than the relation of the four evangelists.—ED.

establish agrees mainly with that of Mr. Greswell unfolded in his valuable "Dissertations." The same general results, with some important variations, were reached in the "*Horæ Evangelicæ*" by a process of induction from the internal evidence. While the treatise was in the press, the work of Da Costa on the Four Witnesses appeared. His general conclusions as to the order of the gospels, their mutual dependence, and their internal signs of authenticity, are nearly the same as my own. The subject was treated by him in a more free and popular style, while my treatment of it approached more nearly to a strictly inductive inquiry. He came, independently, to the same conclusions, but my work embraced a wider range.

The vulgar scoffs of earlier adversaries of the Gospel have of late been largely replaced by speculations of Pantheistic philosophy. The gospels, according to many recent writers, are not real histories, but collections of early legends, and had their origin in ideal conceptions of the Messiah, which were gradually made to cluster around the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

Such a view of the gospels plainly implies that their composition must be referred to a date considerably later than the events they profess to record. Hence it is maintained by all patrons of this theory that they were not written till the close of the first or middle of the second century; and that this interval of sixty or seventy years from the crucifixion is enough to account for the growth of such legends, and their reduction into the definite shape in which the history now appears.

An hypothesis of this kind is too unnatural to last. In our own country, at least, there is too much instinctive common sense to offer a favourable soil for its propagation. Yet the show of learning and philosophy in its advocates may give them even among ourselves some power to deceive. Even those who reject the theory as a whole may not entirely escape its influence.

Admissions respecting errors and inconsistencies in the gospels, which abound in the replies of foreign critics to

the mythical theory, are perhaps only one degree less dangerous than the system they are used to overthrow. Many of the premises on which the infidel scheme of explanation is founded are received one by one by many of its opponents in Germany, and even in England, as if they were certain results of critical inquiry.

No doubt even if the gospels were as imperfect as these writers admit them to be, the substantial truth of the history might still be clear, and the essentials of Christianity might remain unimpaired. But a close search will prove how baseless are the claims of this negative criticism. The very parties who reject the plenary inspiration of the gospels, and charge them with anachronism, error, and contradictions, differ in their judgment on almost every separate question on which these charges are founded, and betray continually a looseness of conjecture and a rashness of hasty inference which may well justify a complete distrust of their most confident decisions.

Two principles very commonly admitted by foreign critics are the total irregularity of the gospels, and the late date of their publication, so that even the earliest was not in existence in the first century. The tendency of these opinions is to remove some of the most effectual barriers to the growth of this mythical form of infidelity. Unwritten tradition is a very faithless keeper of historical truth. If the life of our Lord was unwritten for more than forty, or even seventy years, and the writers who first recorded it paid no respect at all to the order of time and the real sequence of events, their narratives must lie open to many natural suspicions, and it cannot seem very unlikely that facts and legends to a considerable extent might be confounded together. It is not surprising, when such admissions have been constantly made, that the unbelieving speculations of Strauss should have been followed by other works of a kindred character. The same principles continue their mischievous activity to the present hour. Their most recent manifestations in our own country are Spencer's "First Principles," Greg's "Creed of Christendom" and "Supernatural Religion." In Germany the works of Baur,

Schopenhauer, Hæckel, and in France the "Evangiles" and "Antichrist" of Renan.

In the twenty-eight years since the "Horæ" was published, the following English works have appeared in substantial agreement with its line of defence :—

First and chiefly, the "Commentaries" of Bishop Wordsworth; (2) "Lectures on the Diatessaron," by Dr. Macbride; (3) Maclellan's "New Testament, 1875;" (4) "Historical Lectures on the Life of Christ," by Bishop Ellicott; (5) The Appendix B., pp. 409-448 of the "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament," by Dr. Wescott. 5th edition.

The main principles of my own work are these six :—

1. The authenticity of the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew.
2. The intermediate date, authenticity, and integrity of St. Mark and St. Luke.
3. The authenticity of St. John's Gospel.
4. The individual authorship but mutual interdependence of all the Four.
5. The early date of the Synoptists between A.D. 30-63.
6. The Divine inspiration, real consistency, and entire truthfulness of all the Four.

I shall endeavour now, after a full and careful consideration of the leading works which advocate a different or opposite view, to confirm anew, with partial modifications and corrections, the chief conclusions of my former work, and to fortify¹ them by a considerable variety of additional arguments drawn from the text of the New Testament, or the remains of early antiquity.

May He who is the Giver of all Wisdom direct and prosper this attempt to vindicate and to confirm the authority of His Own Word, that it may minister to the glory of His holy Name.

¹ This enlargement, as will be seen from my Preface, was never fully carried out.—ED.

BOOK I.

THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SCOPE OF THE INQUIRY.

THE usual tradition of early times refers the four gospels to the apostles Matthew and John, to Mark, the companion of Peter, and Luke, the companion of Paul, as their respective authors. External evidence of authorship and date of gospels.

The most general opinion was that they were written in the order in which they now stand,¹ but Clement has a statement that the gospels which contain the genealogies were written first.² In early as well as in later times, opinions have varied as to their absolute date. Irenæus seems to refer St. Matthew's gospel to the time of St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome;³ while later writers, Cosmas,⁴

¹ Origen apud Euseb., "Ecc. Hist.," vi. 25; Jerome, "Procem. in Matt.," vol. iv. p. 8.

² Clement of Alexandria quoted Euseb., "Hist.," vi. 14, προγεγράφσαι τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας.

³ Irenæus, "Hær.," iii. 1, p. 174, Ὁ μὲν δὲ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξηνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

⁴ "Cosmas Indicopleustes," v. p. 245, Οὗτος διωγμὸν γενόμενον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ὅτε τὸν Στέφανον ἐλιθοβόλησαν, μέλλων καὶ αὐτός τὰ Ἱεροσόλομα καταλιπεῖν, αἰτησάντων αὐτόν τινων τῶν πιστῶν, ἔγγραφον αὐτοῖς διδασκαλίαν καταλιπεῖν δοκιμάσας, τὴν ἐν σαρκὶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ γῆς διατριβὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνεγράψατο.

2 THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

Isidore of Seville,¹ and Theophylact² place it only eight or ten years after the Ascension.

St. Mark, according to Clement, Epiphanius, Athanasius, and Jerome,³ published his gospel at Rome after a visit of St. Peter to that city. St. Luke, according to Gregory Nazianzen and Jerome,⁴ published his in Achaia, whilst that of St. John, according to Irenæus,⁵ was written and published at Ephesus. There is, however, in each instance, some diversity of judgment even in writers of the first four centuries with regard to the place and time of their composition.

Internal evidence.

When we refer to the internal evidence, the three first gospels present very peculiar features, both of resemblance and diversity. In some passages there is a complete and verbal agreement, while they differ considerably in the order of the events or in minor details of the history.

Three leading views.

Three leading explanations have been proposed by modern writers to account for this peculiar structure.

(1) Common documents.

Some affirm them to have been derived from common documents which the evangelists merely combined in a different manner in composing their own works.

(2) Oral teaching.

Others conceive them to have arisen quite independently

¹ "Isidorus Hispalensis, Chronicon," 4 M 5238, *opera ed.* Migne, t. vii. p. 89. Gaius Caligula regnat annis iv. Per idem tempus Matthaeus Apostolus Evangelium primus in Judæa scripsit. (Isidore's Chronicle was written in the seventeenth year of Heraclius.)

² Theophylactus in Matthaeum praefatio, 'Ο τοίνυν Ματθαῖος, πρῶτος πάντων ἔγραψε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐβραΐδι φωνῇ πρὸς τοὺς ἐξ Ἑβραίων πιστεύσαντας μετὰ ὀκτὼ ἔτη τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀναλήψεως.

³ Clem. Alex. Hypotyp. v. ap. Eus. H. E. II. 15, τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ρώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον καὶ Πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξιπύοντος, τοὺς παρόντας πολλοὺς ὄντας παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτοῦ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα· ποιήσαντα δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ. Hieronymus, "De Viris Illustribus," 8. I have been unable to verify the references to Epiphanius and Athanasius.—Ed.

⁴ Greg. Nazianz., p. 275. Λουκάς δ' Ἑλλάδι σεπτὰ θεοῦ τάδε θάναματ' ἔγραψεν. Hieron. in Matthaeum prologus, t. vii. p. 3. Lucas Medicus in Achaiae Boeotiaeque partibus volumen condidit.

⁵ Irenæus, u. s. Ἰωάννης ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων.

of each other from the oral teaching of the apostles, which they view as the common source of the narratives, and as sufficient to explain their partial agreement.

Others, again, maintain them to be successive, and that each writer was acquainted with the gospels previously written, so as to make use of their contents, besides having access to distinct and original sources of information.

The first of these views prevailed in Germany towards the close of last century, and ¹ Bishop Marsh's "Dissertation" gave it a currency in England.

The general opinion both in Germany and America has latterly inclined much more to the second view; and the independent origin of the gospels from oral traditions of the apostles has been the favourite theory with critics of eminence. It was held by Drs. Mill and Lardner in the last century, and more recently by Strauss and the mystical theorists, and by Neander, Olshausen, Tholuck, Norton, and Alford, among the critical champions of historical Christianity. All of them seem to agree that the three earlier gospels are irregular and fragmentary memoirs, and partially inaccurate, though substantially true; and that they were composed separately from the oral statements of the apostles about thirty or forty years after the date of the Crucifixion.

The third opinion, which was prevalent among the Fathers,² has also its advocates in modern times. In our own country, Dr. Townson³ in the last century, and Mr.

(3) Mutual succession.

Support accorded to the several views. The last adopted in the present work.

¹ Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough, 1819. His theory was put forward in an appendix to his translation of Michaelis' "Introduction to the New Testament." See Prof. Salmon's "Introduction," p. 147.—ED.

² Augustine in his "de Consensu Evangelistarum." The only ancient work, so far as I know, expressly dealing with the subject says: "Quamvis singuli (Evangelistæ) suum quendam narrandi ordinem tenuisse videantur, non tamen unus quisque eorum velut alterius præcedentis ignorans voluisse scribere reperitur, vel ignorata prætermisisse quæ scripsisse alius invenitur, sed sicut unicuique inspiratum est, non superfluum operationem sui laboris adiecit."—Lib. i. 4.

³ "Discourses on the Four Gospels, chiefly with regard to the peculiar design of each, and the order and places in which they were written," by Rev. Thomas Townson, D.D., 5th ed., Dublin, 1844.

4 THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

Greswell¹ in the present, have maintained it with much force of argument. Use will be made of their labours in the following work, but an endeavour will be made to confirm the explanation of the gospels thus offered by a strictly inductive and comprehensive inquiry.

The method
of inquiry.

For this end it will be needful first to compare St. Matthew and St. Mark; then St. Luke with both of them; and lastly the gospel of St. John with all the three earlier narratives.

To facilitate the comparison, it is desirable to begin with exhibiting a numbered syllabus of the three first gospels, in the part which is common to them all, or from the Baptism of John to the Resurrection. The gospel of St. Mark as the shortest will be taken for the basis, and the numbers borrowed from it are applied to the answering portion in the others.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS FROM THE BAPTISM OF JOHN ARRANGED UPON THE BASIS OF ST. MARK.

EXPLANATION.—The numbers in St. Mark are continuous. The sections in St. Matthew and St. Luke that correspond with St. Mark, are noted by the same numbers. The sections in St. Matthew that do not correspond with any in St. Mark are noted by continuous English letters, and those in St. Luke (with one exception) by continuous Greek letters. The long section, St. Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, is marked by a capital A. The longer discourses in St. Matthew are marked in stronger type. The sections peculiar to each gospel are noted in italics.

ST. MARK.	ST. MATTHEW.	ST. LUKE.
1. Baptism of John, i. 1-5.	1. } Baptism and Preaching of	1. } Baptism and Preaching of
2. Preaching of John, i. 6-8.	2. } John, iii. 1-12.	2. } John, iii. 1-18.
		a. Imprisonment, iii. 19, 20.
3. Baptism of Jesus, i. 9-11.	3. Baptism of Jesus, iii. 13-17.	3. Baptism of Jesus, iii. 21, 22.
		β. Genealogy, iii. 23-38.

¹ Greswell, "Harmony of Gospels, particularly Dissertation, I. and II." vol. i.

ST. MARK.

4. The Temptation, i. 12, 13.
5. Return to Galilee, i. 14, 15.
6. Call of Four Apostles, i. 16-20.
7. Dispossession, i. 21-28.
8. Simon's Wife's Mother, i. 29-31.
9. Cures at Evening, i. 32-34.
10. Departure (*with fresh particulars*), i. 35-38.
11. Circuit of Galilee, i. 39.
12. Cure of Leper, i. 40-45.
13. Paralytic, ii. 1-12.
14. Call of Levi, ii. 13, 14.
15. Feast in House, ii. 15-22.
16. Walk in Cornfields, ii. 23-28.
17. Withered Hand, iii. 1-6.
18. Retirement to Sea, iii. 7-12.
19. Twelve Ordained, iii. 13-19.
20. *Friends interfere*, iii. 20, 21.

ST. MATTHEW.

4. The Temptation, iv. 1-11.
5. Return to Galilee, iv. 12-17.
6. Call of Four Apostles, iv. 18-22.
11. Circuit of Galilee, iv. 23-25.
- A. Sermon on the Mount*, v.-vii.
12. Cure of Leper, viii. 1-4.
- b. Centurion's Servant*, viii. 5-13.
8. Simon's Wife's Mother, viii. 14-15.
9. Cures at Evening, viii. 16-17.
- c. Answers to Disciples*, viii. 18-22.
24. Storm at Sea, viii. 23-27.
25. Gadarene Demoniacs, viii. 28-ix. 1.
13. Paralytic, ix. 2-8.
14. Call of Matthew, ix. 9.
15. Feast in House, ix. 10-17.
26. Ruler's Daughter, ix. 18-26.
- d. Healing two blind men*, ix. 27-31.
- e. Dumb possessed*, ix. 32-35.
- f. Prayer for labourers*, ix. 36-38.
28. Mission of Twelve, x. 1-42.

ST. LUKE.

4. The Temptation, iv. 1-13.
5. Return to Galilee, iv. 14, 15.
- γ. Visit to Nazareth*, iv. 16-32.
7. Dispossession, iv. 33-37.
8. Simon's Wife's Mother, iv. 38, 39.
9. Cures at Evening, iv. 40, 41.
10. Departure, iv. 42, 43.
11. Circuit of Galilee, iv. 44.
- δ. Miraculous Draught*, v. 1-11.
12. Cure of Leper, v. 12-16.
13. Paralytic, v. 17-26.
14. Call of Levi, v. 27, 28.
15. Feast in House, v. 29-39.
16. Walk in Cornfields, vi. 1-5.
17. Withered Hand, vi. 6-12.
19. Twelve Ordained, vi. 13-16.
- ε. Cures*, vi. 17-19.
- ζ. Sermon on Plain*, vi. 20-49.
- η. Centurion's Servant*, vii. 1-10.
- θ. Widow of Nain*, vii. 11-18.
- ι. Message of Baptist*, vii. 19-35.
- κ. Feast in Simon's House*, vii. 36-50.
- λ. Ministering Women*, viii. 1-3.

6 THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

ST. MARK.	ST. MATTHEW.	ST. LUKE.
	Discourse.	
	g. Message of Baptist, xi. 1-19.	
	h. <i>Warnings and Invitations</i> , xi. 20-30.	
	16. Cornfields, xii. 1-9.	
	17. Withered Hand, xii. 10-13.	
	18. Retirement to Sea, xii. 14-21.	
21. Discourse on Blasphemy, iii. 22-30.	21. Discourse on Blasphemy, xii. 22-37.	
	i. <i>Request for Sign</i> , xii. 38-45.	
22. Visit of Mother, iii. 31-35.	22. Visit of Mother, xii. 46-50.	23. Parables, viii. 4-18.
23. Parables, iv. 1-34. (<i>Seed growing secretly</i> , iv. 26-29.)	23. Parables, xiii. 1-52. (<i>Four in Matthew alone.</i>)	22. Visit of Mother, viii. 19-21.
24. Tempest Stilled, iv. 35-41.		24. Tempest Stilled, viii. 22-25.
25. Gadarenes, v. 1-20.		25. Gadarenes, viii. 26-40.
26. Ruler's Daughter, v. 21-43.		26. Ruler's Daughter, viii. 41-56.
27. Visit to Nazareth, vi. 1-6.	27. Visit to Nazareth, xiii. 53-58.	
28. Mission of Twelve, vi. 7-13.		28. Mission of Twelve, ix. 1-6.
29. Death of Baptist, vi. 14-29.	29. Death of Baptist, xiv. 1-12.	29. Herod and Baptist, ix. 7-9.
30. Return of Twelve, vi. 30-33.		30. Return of Twelve, ix. 10.
31. Five Thousand, vi. 34-46.	31. Five Thousand, xiv. 13-21.	31. Five Thousand, ix. 11-17.
32. Walking on Sea, vi. 47-52.	32. Walking on Sea, xiv. 22-33.	
33. Cures, vi. 53-56.	33. Cures, xiv. 34-36.	
34. Scribes and Pharisees, vii. 1-23.	34. Scribes and Pharisees, xv. 1-20.	
35. Woman of Canaan, vii. 24-30.	35. Woman of Canaan, xv. 21-28.	
36. <i>Deaf Man cured</i> , vii. 31-37.	j. <i>Many cures</i> , xv. 29-31.	
37. Four Thousand, viii. 1-9.	37. Four Thousand, xv. 32-39.	
38. Request for Sign, viii. 10-13.	38. Request for Sign, xvi. 1-4.	
39. Leaven of Pharisees, viii. 14-21.	39. Leaven of Pharisees, xvi. 5-12.	

ST. MARK.	ST. MATTHEW.	ST. LUKE.
40. <i>Blind Man healed</i> , viii. 22-26.		
41. Peter's Confession, viii. 27; ix. 1.	41. Peter's Confession, xvi. 13-38.	41. Peter's Confession, ix. 18-27.
42. Transfiguration, ix. 2-13.	42. Transfiguration, xvii. 1-13.	42. Transfiguration, ix. 28-36.
43. Cure of Demoniac, ix. 14-29.	43. Cure of Demoniac, xvii. 14-21.	43. Cure of Demoniac, ix. 37-42.
44. Journey in Galilee, ix. 30-32.	44. Journey in Galilee, xvii. 22-23.	44. Journey and Warning, ix. 43-45.
	<i>k. Temple Tribute</i> , xvii. 24-27.	
45. Dispute at Capernaum, ix. 33-37.	45. Dispute at Capernaum, xviii. 1-6.	45. Dispute, ix. 46-48.
46. Inquiry of John, ix. 38-41.		46. Inquiry of John, ix. 49-50.
47. Warning against offences, ix. 42-50.	47. Warning against offences, xviii. 7-11.	
	<i>l. Parable of Sheep</i> , xviii. 12-14.	A. St. Luke, ix. 51; xviii. 14. <i>Incidents on Journeys to Jerusalem peculiar to St. Luke. For cases where the peculiarity is open to question see Book I., ch. vii.</i>
	<i>m. Brother's Transgresses</i> , xviii. 15-22.	
	<i>n. Unmerciful Servant</i> , xviii. 23-35.	
48. Divorce, x. 1-12.	48. Divorce, xix. 1-12.	
49. Blessing Children, x. 13-16.	49. Blessing Children, xix. 13-15.	49. Blessing Children, xviii. 15-17.
50. Rich Young Man, x. 17-31.	50. Rich Young Man, xix. 16-30.	50. Rich Young Man, xviii. 18-30.
	<i>o. Parable of Labourers</i> , xx. 1-16.	
51. Prediction of Suffering, x. 32-34.	51. Prediction of Suffering, xx. 17-19.	51. Prediction of Suffering, xviii. 31-34.
52. Sons of Zebedee, x. 35-40.	52. Sons of Zebedee, xx. 20-23.	
53. Lesson of Humility, x. 41-45.	53. Lesson of Humility, xx. 24-28.	
54. Bartimæus, x. 46-52.	54. Blind Men of Jericho, xx. 29-34.	54. Blind Man at Jericho, xviii. 35-43. <i>μ. Zaccheus</i> , xix. 1-10.
		<i>ν. Parable of Pounds</i> , xix. 11-27.
55. Entrance to Jerusalem, xi. 1-11.	55. Entrance to Jerusalem, xxi. 1-11.	55. Entrance to Jerusalem, xix. 28-40.

8 THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

ST. MARK.	ST. MATTHEW.	ST. LUKE. ζ. <i>Lament over Jerusalem</i> , xix. 41-44.
56. Cursing fig-tree, xi. 12-14.		
57. Cleansing Tem- ple, xi. 15-19.	57. Cleansing Tem- ple, xxi. 12-16.	57. Cleaning Temple, xix. 45-48.
58. Fig-tree withered, xi. 20-26.	56 and 58. Cursing fig- tree, xxi. 17-22.	
59. Question of Au- thority, xi. 27- 33.	59. Question of Au- thority, xxi. 23- 27. <i>p. Parable of Two Sons</i> , xxi. 28-32.	59. Question of Au- thority, xx. 1-8.
60. Parable of Vine- yard, xii. 1-12.	60. Parable of Vine- yard, xxi. 33-46. <i>q. Parable of Wed- ding</i> , xxii. 1-14.	60. Parable of Vine- yard, xx. 9-18.
61. Tribute Money, xii. 13-17.	61. Tribute Money, xxii. 15-22.	61. Tribute Money, xx. 19-26.
62. Sadducees, xii. 18-27.	62. Sadducees, xxii. 23-33.	62. Sadducees, xx. 27- 38.
63. Great Command- ment, xii. 28-34.	63. Great Command- ment, xxii. 34-40.	
64. Christ David's Son, xii. 35-37.	64. Christ David's Son, xxii. 41-46.	64. Christ David's Son, xx. 39-44.
65. Warnings against Scribes, xii. 38- 40.	65. Warnings against Scribes, xxiii. 1- 39.	65. Warnings, xx. 45- 47.
66. Widow's Mite, xii. 41-44.		66. Widow's Mite, xxi. 1-4.
67. Prophecy on Mount, xiii. 1- 37.	67. Prophecy, xxiv. 1- 51. <i>r. Parables</i> , xxv. 1-46.	67. Prophecy, xxi. 5- 38.
68. Anointing at Bethany, xiv. 1- 9.	68. Anointing at Bethany, xxvi. 1-13.	
69. Treachery of Judas, xiv. 10, 11.	69. Treachery of Judas, xxvi. 14- 16.	69. Treachery of Judas, xxii. 1-6.
70. Passover pre- pared, xiv. 12-16.	70. Passover pre- pared, xxvi. 17- 19.	70. Passover pre- pared, xxii. 7-13.
71. Warning to Judas, xiv. 17-21.	71. Warning to Judas, xxvi. 20-25.	72. Lord's Supper, xxii. 14-20.
72. Lord's Supper, xiv. 22-25.	72. Lord's Supper, xxvi. 26-29.	71. Warning to Judas, xxii. 21-23. <i>o. Dispute about greatness</i> , xxii. 24-30.
73. Warning to Peter, xiv. 26-31.	73. Warning to Peter, xxvi. 30-35.	73. Warning to Peter, xxii. 31-34.

ST. MARK.	ST. MATTHEW.	ST. LUKE.
		<i>π. Question of Sword</i> , xxii. 35-38.
74. The Agony, xiv. 32-42.	74. The Agony, xxvi. 36-46.	74. The Agony, xxii. 39-46.
75. The Apprehension, xiv. 43-46.	75. The Apprehension, xxvi. 47-50.	75. The Apprehension, xxii. 47-49.
76. Servant's Ear, xiv. 47-50.	76. Servant's Ear, xxvi. 51-56.	76. Servant's Ear, xxii. 50-53.
77. <i>The Young Man</i> , xiv. 51, 52.		
78. Jesus before Caiaphas, xiv. 53-64.	78. Jesus before Caiaphas, xxvi. 57-66.	80. Peter's Denial, xxii. 54-62.
79. Jesus Mocked, xiv. 65.	79. Jesus Mocked, xxvi. 67-68.	79. Jesus Mocked, xxii. 63-65.
80. Peter's Denial, xiv. 66-72.	80. Peter's Denial, xxvi. 69-75.	<i>ρ. Second Examination before Council</i> , xxii. 66-71.
81. Jesus before Pilate, xv. 1-5.	81. Jesus before Pilate, xxvii. 1, 2.	81. Jesus and Pilate, xxiii. 1-5.
	<i>s. Repentance of Judas</i> , xxvii. 3-10.	<i>σ. Jesus and Herod</i> , xxiii. 6-12.
82. Release of Barabbas, xv. 6-15.	82. Release of Barabbas, xxvii. 11-26.	82. Jesus and Barabbas, xxiii. 13-25.
	<i>t. Pilate's Wife</i> , xxvii. 19.	
	<i>υ. Hand-Washing</i> , xxvii. 24-25.	
83. Scourging and Mockery, xv. 15-20.	83. Scourging and Mockery, xxvii. 26-31.	
84. Crucifixion, xv. 21-28.	84. Crucifixion, xxvii. 32-38.	84. Crucifixion, xxiii. 26-34.
		<i>τ. Daughters of Jerusalem</i> , xxiii. 27-31.
85. Revilings, xv. 29-32.	85. Revilings, xxvii. 39-44.	85. Revilings, xxiii. 35-38.
		<i>υ. Penitent Thief</i> , xxiii. 39-43.
86. Darkness, xv. 33-36.	86. Darkness, xxvii. 45-49.	86. Darkness, xxiii. 44, 45.
87. The Death, xv. 37-39.	87. The Death, xxvii. 50-54.	87. The Death, xxiii. 46-48.
88. Women at the Cross, xv. 40-41.	88. Women at Cross, xxvii. 55, 56.	88. Women at Cross, xxiii. 49.
89. Burial by Joseph, xv. 42-46.	89. Burial by Joseph, xxvii. 57-61.	89. Burial by Joseph, xxiii. 50-56.
	<i>υ. Setting Watch</i> , xxvii. 62-66.	

10 THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

ST. MARK.	ST. MATTHEW.	ST. LUKE.
90. Women at Sepulchre, xv. 47; xvi. 8.	90. Women at Sepulchre, xxviii. 1-8.	90. Women at Sepulchre, xxiv. 1-11.
91. Appearance to Magdalen, xvi. 9-11.	w. <i>Earthquake</i> , xxviii. 2-4.	φ. St. Peter at Sepulchre, xxiv. 12.
92. Appearance to Two Disciples, xvi. 12, 13.	æ. <i>Appearance to Women</i> , xxviii. 9, 10.	92. Walk to Emmaus, xxiv. 13-35.
93. Appearance to Eleven, xvi. 14.	y. <i>Report of Watch</i> , xxviii. 11-15.	93. Appearance to Eleven, xxiv. 36-43.
94. Last Commission, xvi. 15-18.	z. <i>Appearance in Galilee</i> , xxviii. 16-20.	94. Last Commission, xxiv. 44-49.
95. The Ascension, xvi. 19, 20.		95. The Ascension, xxiv. 50, 51. χ. <i>Temple Worship</i> , xxiv. 52, 53.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE RELATION OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK.

THERE are four main particulars in which the gospels may be compared together in order to illustrate their origin by internal presumptions. These are, the selection of events, the order of arrangement, the *resemblance* of the historical details, and the *distinctive* features of phraseology and style.

Four subjects
of comparison.

In such a comparison each of the three hypotheses before mentioned will naturally yield a different result. The gospels if they arose out of common documents variously combined, might differ greatly in the selection and arrangement of the events, but the details and phraseology, wherever the same event was recorded, would be the same. If they arose independently from oral tradition, not only the selection and arrangement, but still more the details and the phraseology, would be almost certain to differ widely. On the other hand, if each writer had access to the previous gospels, and made use of this knowledge in composing his own work, so important an element in their structure could hardly fail to reveal itself, either by a close resemblance, where the incidents recorded are the same, or by a supplementary relation to each other, when they differ; and this character will be more apparent, with every fresh narrative that we include in the inquiry.

Let us begin with the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, the two first in order in the actual arrangement, and the two which bear the closest resemblance to each other. Their contents, from the Baptism of John, are expressed by the two numbered lists, just given; and the letters denote those portions of the first, which are wanting in the second gospel.

Selection of
events.

It appears, by this comparison, that of one hundred and eleven portions in St. Matthew, and ninety-five in St. Mark, about eighty are common to both, or in number, more than two-thirds of the whole. Also, that of sixty-seven particulars in St. Mark, Nos. 29-95, fifty-seven appear in the other gospel, with one single variation only, in the same relative order. This deviation is found in the cursing of the fig-tree, which St. Mark mentions before, and St. Matthew after, the cleansing of the Temple.

In the presence of this simple fact, it is surprising how modern critics could ever assert that the gospels are alike unchronological in their structure, and independent in their origin. Two writers, unacquainted with each other, may agree in the order of their narratives, if each adheres to the true succession of events; or their arrangement may be the same, while different from the true order, if one has borrowed from the other. But if they write independently, from loose traditions, and neglect the real order of time, such a close agreement, without a miracle, seems incredible. And yet many critics have fallen into this great inconsistency; and offer, as the ripest result of learned inquiry, an hypothesis which leaves the most prominent feature in the mutual relation of the gospels entirely unexplained.

Since, however, this view of the gospels, as irregular and independent, is held by eminent writers, let us test it more closely. The ministry of our Lord lasted, we infer from the New Testament, about three years. St. John assures us, that if all the things that Jesus did were written, the world itself could not contain the books, and so it is a moderate estimate, that each day of such a life would produce, on an average, at least one event, whether miracle, discourse, or journey, deemed worthy by his followers of a distinct notice. Of these thousand particulars, if each apostle retained a hundred in his oral teaching, it would be probable that more than 700 would be retained in the collective tradition. Or if there were fifty events so prominent, as to be preserved by all the apostles, still the total number, in case of an independent choice for the rest, would amount to 400. Two gospels, framed from such

traditions alone, could never exhibit the agreement which actually appears between those of St. Matthew and St. Mark, unless the tradition were confined to one or two eye-witnesses. But this limitation changes the very nature of the hypothesis; since an oral tradition, as full in its contents and definite in arrangement as a written document, would be thus assumed for the common basis of the two gospels. The hypothesis of oral tradition, in its simple and natural form, can never explain the actual correspondence between them.¹

Let us now test the other hypothesis, of a common document, transcribed by both writers, with varying interpolations. It may be supposed that there was a primitive gospel, which contained the seventy particulars, common to both, in their actual order; and that the rest was added, either from other documents, or from general tradition. In this case, however, the parts transcribed from the common source would be almost verbally the same. If a latitude of alteration be supposed, the hypothesis falls to the ground; since no common document can be required to account for the existence of two accounts of the same event, different both in language and in details. The only presumption for a common derivation from such a written source, would be a resemblance in these borrowed portions hardly differing from complete identity.

Now in the gospels this feature is almost entirely wanting. The same events are recorded in more than seventy cases, but the phraseology, and the choice of details, in most of these, are very distinct. The differences are not such as could be explained by the further hypothesis of two trans-

¹ I have slightly modified the expression of this paragraph without, I think, affecting the substance of the argument. Would not the advocate of independent origin from oral tradition reply that in our first two gospels we have not the "collective tradition" but that of two eye-witnesses only, St. Matthew and St. Peter; whilst the gospel of St. Luke being professedly the outcome of historical research, stands on a somewhat different footing? Still it is hard to believe that out of so great a mass of material, twelve years of common teaching alone, without any other influence, would have reduced the different traditions of any two of the twelve to such close uniformity.—ED.

lations from the same Hebrew original.¹ Thus, for instance, in No. 34, the account of the Syrophenician has only one clause, out of fourteen, where there is an approach to identity, and the details and arrangement are quite different. The notion of two extracts or transcripts from the same original document is here quite untenable. And since the remark applies to a large proportion of those particulars, where the main event is the same, the hypothesis of a primitive document from which these two gospels might both have been derived, fails entirely to account for their agreement.

But the same facts are equally adverse to the opinion, held by so many recent critics, that the evangelists pay little or no regard to the true order of time. When fifty or sixty distinct events are recorded by two writers in the very same order, the only reasonable explanation must be in one of two alternatives. Each of them must have adhered to the order of time, or one of them has followed the other's arrangement. If we confine our view to the later portions, Nos. 29-95, Matt. xiv.-xxviii., Mark vi. 14-xvi., either view would account for the agreement. But since the order is different in the previous chapters, it is plain that one writer has not adopted implicitly the other's arrangement, and hence their agreement in the later portion is a strong presumption, if not an absolute proof, that both of them have there adhered to the true order of succession in the events themselves.

Arrangement
of events.

II. This question of arrangement is the next subject for comparison. Here, in the earlier chapters, there is a serious discordance, which will be seen if we distinguish the successive parts of St. Matthew by the numbers borrowed from St. Mark's gospel. The series runs as follows:—1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, A, 12, b, 8, 9, c, 24, 25, 13, 14, 15, 26, d, e, f, 28, g, h, 16, 17, 18, 21, i, 22, 23, 27, 29. Either both narratives are irregular, or one has observed, and the other

¹ The hypothesis of a common *Aramaic* original is most interestingly worked out by Prof. J. T. Marshall in the "Expositor" for 1891; but he does not profess that it can give a complete account of the variations.—ED.

has departed from, the real succession. On the former view it is difficult to explain the sameness of order in the rest of the narrative. Why should both neglect it up to the same point, and then begin to adhere to it together? It is far simpler and more natural to suppose that one of them has transposed the events in a limited part of the history, and restored the true order elsewhere; and that the other has rectified this partial transposition.

In which of the gospels, then, has the true order been observed? The most natural test will be, a comparison with a third gospel, that of St. Luke, in the same portion of the narrative. The sequence will there be as follows, where the numbers denote the order in St. Mark, and the Greek letters the portions found in St. Luke only.

1, 2, α , 3, β , 4, 5, γ , 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, δ , 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, ϵ - λ , 23, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29.

It is plain that, although several insertions are made, the order is the same in both, with one slight exception, in the visit of the mother of Jesus, No. 22. If the call of the disciples, No. 6, be identified with the Miraculous Draught, δ , this would prove a second inversion. But in 22 or 23 out of 24 instances, the agreement is complete. There is thus a most weighty presumption that St. Mark has observed the true order, and St. Matthew in part forsaken it. The agreement of St. Mark and St. Luke in this portion, as of St. Matthew and St. Mark in the other, implies that one has copied the other's arrangement, or that both have adhered to the real sequence. But if St. Luke had access to St. Mark's gospel, he would probably have access also to that of St. Matthew, and there seems no reason why he should prefer one order to the other, except his conviction that it was more agreeable to the actual order of the history. This conclusion from the evidence of the third gospel is confirmed by the words of its preface, where the writer apparently states his intention of adhering to the order of the events themselves.

This explanation, however, is still imperfect, unless a sufficient reason can be suggested for the irregularity in St. Matthew. But such a reason presents itself at once in the

structure of his gospel. The irregular portion, on this view, is chap. v.-xiii. inclusive. Two-thirds of the whole consists of discourses of our Lord, and less than one-third is direct narrative. The writer brings prominently forward the Sermon on the Mount, and the apostolic commission, or the fundamental code of Christian morality, and the great charter of the Christian ministry. It can neither be surprising nor unusual, therefore, if, like other historians, he has partially sacrificed the order of time to secure a more important object. At chapter xiv. simple narrative begins to predominate, and from this point the order is the same in both gospels. St. Mark has omitted those two long discourses, and has reported the parables more briefly than St. Matthew, while the narrative is given with fuller details. The first part of his gospel is thus homogeneous in character with the rest; and hence it would be natural for him to rectify any transpositions of St. Matthew, since the occasion of them was entirely removed.

A more detailed examination will confirm the view, that the second gospel has restored the true order of time, where the first had departed from it. The agreement in Nos. 1-6 is complete, for here no discourse intervenes to occasion irregularity. But the writer of the first gospel, hastening to record the sermon, which is one of its main features, has passed over four particulars, which appear in St. Mark, and comes at once to the general circuit of Galilee. The cure of the leper has the same position in both, after that circuit. The healing of the Centurion's servant is not found in the second gospel. Hence the cures in and without Simon's house, Nos. 8, 9, are the first positive divergence. And it seems clear that St. Mark has restored these to their true place. He marks the day when they occurred, the first Sabbath of our Lord's public teaching in Capernaum after the call of Simon, and when the demoniac had just been publicly healed. He notes equally the events that followed the evening cures, namely, the retirement of Jesus for prayer, before it was day, and the eager search made for him by Simon. In the first gospel, on the contrary, there is no necessary connection between these cures and the

events which are mentioned before and after them, the healing of the Centurion's servant, and the voyage across the lake of Tiberias. In their first deviation, it is thus plain that St. Mark has rectified a transposition in the first gospel.

The voyage itself is the next divergence, since it is placed much later in St. Mark than the cures at Capernaum on the Sabbath evening. Now, just as he has precisely fixed the place of those cures, by the events which precede and follow them, he has done the same with the voyage. After his mention of the teaching in parables, he has added, with unusual precision, (Mark iv. 35) "And the same day, when the even was come, he saith unto them, Let us pass over unto the other side." The note of time is so express, as to favour the supposition that the writer intended to fix the true order of an event, which had been much transposed in the earlier gospel. The link is hardly less definite in the return from the voyage, Mark v. 21, 22, "And when Jesus was passed over again by ship unto the other side, much people was gathered unto him, and he was nigh unto the sea. And behold there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name, and he fell at his feet, and besought him greatly."

The next deviation in St. Matthew, compared with the two other gospels, is in the cure of the Paralytic. Accordingly its place is fixed by St. Mark in very definite language, immediately after an absence from Capernaum, which had lasted many days, and during which our Lord had continued to seek retirement in desert places. The same attention to the order of time appears in the Ordination and Mission of the Twelve, which the first gospel has not distinguished, but which appear in St. Mark at a considerable interval, Mark iii. 14-19, vi. 7-13, in agreement with internal probability, and with the testimony of the third gospel.

There are many signs, again, in these chapters of St. Matthew, that a different object is kept in view than the mere sequence of the events. After the call of the disciples, the writer proceeds at once to the Sermon on the

Mount, and for this purpose a whole circuit of Galilee, with a multitude of cures and dispossessions, is briefly summed up in two verses. After the sermon, and a selection of particular miracles, the writer again hastens to the mission of the Apostles, and entirely overlooks their ordination, to which he merely alludes as a notorious fact, which had occurred before. The events Matt. viii. 2, 5, 14, 18, have no formal links of connection in the narrative. They might be merely selected specimens of our Lord's miracles, without reference to strict sequence in time. They present a moral gradation, from the personal supplication of the leper, through the vicarious requests of the Centurion and of Peter, to the sullen adjuration of the demoniacs of Gadara, refusing and resisting the mercy which they received. It may be inferred, also, from a comparison of the gospels, that the mission of the Twelve did not occur till near the Baptist's death, a little before the third Passover, in the later half of our Lord's ministry. Yet here it is preceded by only three chapters of narrative, while eight others follow it, before the last visit to Jerusalem. It seems clear, then, that the writer has hastened over the previous interval, because he intended that the discourse, of such importance to the Church, should have an early and conspicuous place in his gospel.

There is another circumstance which strongly confirms the view here maintained. If a writer deviates from the order of time for special reasons, in an early part of his narrative, and then resumes it, there will naturally be a portion which has an intermediate character. Events will have to be given, which had been omitted in their true place, from the designed anticipation of others; and these will be irregular, when compared with what precedes, but regular, when compared with all that follows. Now, on the present view, this very feature appears in St. Matthew's gospel. The twelfth and thirteenth chapters are irregular, compared with those which precede them, and regular when compared with those which come after. This will be seen at once by giving the numbers in Matt. viii.-xiv., as follows:—

12, b, 8, 9, c, 24, 25, 13, 14, 15, 26, d, e, f, 28, g, h.

16, 17, 18, 21, i, 22, 23, 27,

29, 31, 32, 33.

Here the numbers 16-27 are regular as regards all those which follow, but irregular with reference to numbers 24, 25, 26, 28, which have come before them. The cause is thus precisely adequate to the effects, and minutely explains them.

There are two reasons, however, which may be urged in opposition to this view of the real order. The first is the character of St. Matthew as an apostle and eye-witness, whose testimony may therefore claim a superior weight to the other two writers. But there is no reason to think that an eye-witness would be more likely, than a diligent investigator, to adhere to the exact order of the events themselves. The relation of time has nearly the same weight for all persons; but place, circumstance, and external associations, are more vivid with an eye-witness than with others, and more likely to divert the mind from the relation of mere sequence alone. The house of Matthew was probably near to the sea, and to the place where he received the tribute. Hence it is likely that the request of Jairus would be made in the same place where the discourse on fasting had been spoken; and an association of circumstance and place might be a substitute, in the mind of the writer, for direct and immediate succession.

The other difficulty is, at first sight, more serious, as an objection to the regularity of the second gospel. The words of Matt. ix. 18, "While he spake these things, there came a certain ruler," seem to establish a close connection between the discourse on fasting, and the cure of the ruler's daughter, numbers 15, 26, which are widely separated both by St. Mark and St. Luke. Three or four solutions of this contrast have been proposed. First, that the discourse is anticipated in these gospels, or placed too early. But all the three writers make the events successive, and apparently continuous, from the curing of the Paralytic to the close of the discourse. And hence, if we attach the feast in all of them to the history of Jairus, we leave the

hiatus undiminished in St. Matthew, introduce a great irregularity into the two other gospels, and separate events, which all of them place together in the same order.

Dr. Townson, again, thinks the cure of the ruler's daughter post-dated in the two other gospels, and that St. Mark preferred affinity of subject to the order of time. When the course of events has brought him again to the place where Jairus lived, he reverts to mention the miracle in his house, though it had been wrought before. But the scene had returned to Capernaum much earlier, Mark iii. 7, or iii. 20. Also two difficulties are made in removing one; for in all the gospels this cure follows the dispossession in Gadara, and our Lord's return to the other side. The event is also clearly linked by St. Mark with the visit to Nazareth.

Besides these explanations, which assume St. Mark to be irregular, Mr. Greswell, who holds his gospel to be strictly regular, offers another, and views the feast and discourse in St. Matthew as distinct from the one recorded by the two other evangelists. This hypothesis, it can scarcely be denied, is harsh and violent. The accounts in Mark and Luke differ as much from each other as either of them from that of St. Matthew, and the agreement in all three is unusually close and full. Though St. Luke alone says explicitly that the feast was in the house of the publican, this is implied in the two other gospels. On the view of the Dissertations, that the gospels are supplementary, the objection to this hypothesis is still more decisive. If the two later evangelists have substituted an earlier feast and discourse for the one in Matthew, from their exact likeness to each other, they would have constructed a perplexing enigma, for which no conceivable motive can be assigned.

The whole difficulty will be at once removed, if the clause in St. Matthew, "while he spake these things," admits of a wider and less exact meaning, than at first sight it seems to convey. If the connection in time was only apparent, and an interval of a few months really separated the feast from the cure, it would be quite natural for the later gospels to restore the true order, and to fix the place of each event in its real context.

One example in St. Matthew, of this looser construction, is found in the very same verse, ix. 18. He thus reports the address of the ruler, "My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay thine hand upon her, and she shall live." Yet the other evangelists show us, that his real request was for her recovery from a mortal sickness (Mark v. 23; Luke viii. 41, 42), and that the news of her death only came after the cure of the woman with the issue. St. Matthew, then, has plainly used considerable latitude of expression in this latter clause of the verse. It must be allowable to use the like freedom, in explaining the true sense of its opening words.

The eighth and ninth chapters of this gospel are only a brief selection out of the events of nearly a year and a half, in which every day must have been busily employed. The former exhibits a brief series of simple miracles. The cure of the Paralytic introduces doctrinal statements, that reveal the grace and compassion of Jesus. It might be the design of the evangelist to mark the connection between striking declarations, and equally impressive acts of grace. It was while Jesus was uttering gracious declarations, like those of which specimens have just been given, that the ruler applied to him, and the doctrine was sealed by a still more splendid miracle of Divine power and love. The whole passage, ix. 2-17, will thus be viewed as a parenthesis, designed to illustrate the gracious and compassionate tone of our Saviour's teaching. The return from Gadara to Capernaum would be a fit occasion for introducing these earlier incidents, which took place in or near the city; and the account is then resumed from the time of that return, by the request of Jairus, and hastens onward to the public mission of the Twelve Apostles.

We have only to suppose, then, that our Lord was uttering similar words of love on his return from Gadara, to those he used in Matthew's house, and that the reference is not to the particular sentence in Matt. ix. 17, but to the whole tenor of his teaching, and the difficulty will be removed.¹

¹ To myself the difficulty does not seem to be removed, but only lessened by these considerations. Is it not simpler to suppose that

A sufficient explanation will be thus given of the clause itself, and a clear reason why the other gospels should restore each event to its proper place in the history.

A close inquiry has thus led to the following results. The first and second gospels, in all the latter part, agree in their arrangement, with scarcely one exception in nearly sixty particulars. Hence either one has borrowed the order of the other, or both have followed the order of time. But that one has borrowed his arrangement from the other is very improbable, because the order is different in their earlier portion. Hence it is almost certain that both of them, in Nos. 29-93, adhere to the real succession of the history. Their difference, in the other part, is most naturally accounted for by the supposition, that the earlier departed here from the true order, and the later has restored it. But the order of St. Mark is entirely confirmed by that of St. Luke, and therefore is probably the actual order, for the same reason as before. Also there is a sufficient reason for the irregularity of St. Matthew in this portion, because one-third of it only is narrative, and the strict succession might be departed from, to give greater prominence to the Sermon on the Mount, and the Apostolic Commission. The details of the comparison fully confirm this view; and the only difficulty of real weight in the opposite scale is removed by due attention to the style and scope of the first evangelist, and the rapid transition which he here makes from the beginning to the later part of our Lord's ministry.

Resemblance
of historical
details.

III. The third subject for comparison is the historical details of each event. Two gospels, merely compiled from a common document, would record the same event in almost the very same words. On the other hand, if they were formed independently from loose traditions, a close

the feast was sometime later than the call? There is no distinct statement in any of the gospels to say that it followed immediately. St. Mark and St. Luke have placed the call in chronological position, and the story of the feast is added as a natural appendix. St. Matthew, the best witness in this particular case, informs us when it occurred. And neither St. Mark nor St. Luke affirms that it occurred at any other time.—ED.

verbal resemblance could rarely exist between them. If one were later than the other, and the second writer knew the work of the first, and had also original materials of his own, the results would be of an intermediate kind. He might sometimes adopt the earlier narrative, almost without a change, sometimes he might interweave partial additions, while in other cases the whole structure of the second narrative might be original and independent. Hence repeated examples of close verbal resemblance between two gospels will exclude the hypothesis of their origin from oral tradition alone; great divergence in their accounts of the same event will equally forbid an explanation by a common document; and both features, when combined, will become a powerful evidence for the successive origin of the gospels, their mutual dependence, and their separate authority.

The first instance of close resemblance is in the account of the Baptist.¹

ST. MATTHEW iii. 4-7.

Now John himself had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey. Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.

ST. MARK i.

6. And John was clothed with camel's hair, and *had* a leathern girdle about his loins, and did eat locusts and wild honey. 5. And there went out unto him all the country of Judæa, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins.

¹ Throughout the comparison of the three gospels in this work, I have quoted from the Revised Version, where my father either followed the Authorized Version or gave a rendering of his own. The translation of the Revisers, I thought, would win more confidence than any private rendering; and by reason of its scrupulous accuracy of detail, it is peculiarly fitted for the especial purpose of the present work. Of course it was not published when my father wrote, nor even when he began his revision of the work. My only hesitation was my knowledge of the grave distrust my father entertained of the principles which guided the Revisers in their selection of the Greek text. However, the cases where difference of reading affect the argument are not sufficiently numerous to form a real objection. If the argument is strong with the text of the Revisers, it would be even stronger with the text adopted by the earlier translators: though at the same time their version would not present it with the same verbal minuteness of comparison.—ED.

The two verses occur in an opposite order, and contain a few slight variations. Yet still the general agreement is so close, that it is hard to account for it, if the gospels were entirely independent.

The resemblance in the call of the disciples is still more striking.

ST. MATTHEW iv. 18-22.

And walking by the sea of Galilee, he saw two brethren, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left the nets, and followed him. And going on from thence he saw other two brethren, James the *son* of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the boat with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they straightway left the boat and their father, and followed him.

ST. MARK i. 16-20.

And passing along by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting a net in the sea: for they were fishers. And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. And straightway they left the nets, and followed him. And going on a little further, he saw James the *son* of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the boat mending the nets. And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired servants, and went after him.

Here also there are a few slight alterations, but the arrangement of the particulars, and even the phraseology, is in general the very same. A briefer instance follows, in the description of our Lord's teaching.

ST. MATTHEW vii. 29.

The multitudes were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as *one* having authority, and not as their scribes.

ST. MARK i. 22.

And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes.

The resemblance in the account of the feast is equally close.

ST. MATTHEW ix. 10-13.

And it came to pass, as he sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with Jesus and his disciples.

And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with the publicans and sinners? But when he heard it, he said, They that are

ST. MARK ii. 15-17.

And it came to pass, that he was sitting at meat in his house, and many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him. And the scribes of the Pharisees, when they saw that he was eating with the sinners and publicans, said unto his disciples, He eateth

whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what *this* meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice ; for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.

and drinketh with publicans and sinners. And when Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick : I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.

The account of the miracle of the loaves, with its sequel, amidst more numerous variations, presents another example of extensive verbal agreement.

ST. MATTHEW xiv. 13-24.

Now when Jesus heard *it*, he withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart: and when the multitudes heard *thereof*, they followed him on foot from the cities. And he came forth, and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, and healed their sick.

And when even was come, the disciples came to him, saying, The place is desert, and the time is already past ; send the multitudes away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves food. But Jesus said unto them, They have no need to go away ; give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves and two fishes. And he said, Bring them hither to me.

And he commanded the multitudes to sit down on the grass ;

and he took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake and gave the loaves to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitudes. And they did all eat, and were filled : and they took up that which remained over of the broken

ST. MARK vi. 33-47.

And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart. And *the people* saw them going, and many knew *them*, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd : and he began to teach them many things. And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far spent : send them away, that they may go into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat. But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread and give them to eat ? And he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye ? *go and see*. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes. And he commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties. And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves ; and he gave to the disciples to set before them ; and the two fishes divided he among them all. And they did all eat, and were filled. And they took up broken

pieces, twelve baskets full. And they that did eat were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

And straightway he constrained the disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before him unto the other side, till he should send the multitudes away. And after he had sent the multitudes away, he went up into the mountain apart to pray: and when even was come, he was there alone. But the boat was now in the midst of the sea, distressed by the waves; for the wind was contrary.

pieces, twelve basketfuls, and also of the fishes. And they that ate the loaves were five thousand men.

And straightway he constrained his disciples to enter into the boat, and to go before *him* unto the other side to Bethsaida, while he himself sendeth the multitude away. And after he had taken leave of them, he departed into the mountain to pray. And when even was come, the boat was in the midst of the sea, and he alone on the land.

Another very exact coincidence occurs in the dispute of the Ten with the sons of Zebedee.

ST. MATTHEW xx. 24-28.

And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation concerning the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

ST. MARK x. 41-45.

And when the ten heard it, they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John. And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

In the parable of the Sower, the resemblance is very nearly as complete.

ST. MATTHEW xiii. 1-9.

On that day went Jesus out of the house, and sat by the sea side. And there were gathered unto him great multitudes, so that he entered into a boat, and sat; and all the multitude stood on the beach. And he spake to them many things in parables,

ST. MARK iv. 1-9.

And again he began to teach by the sea side. And there is gathered unto him a very great multitude, so that he entered into a boat, and sat in the sea; and all the multitude were by the sea on the land. And he taught them many things in parables, and

saying, Behold, the sower went forth to sow; and as he sowed, some *seeds* fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured them: and others fell upon the rocky places, where they had not much earth: and straightway they sprang up, because they had no deepness of earth: and when the sun was risen, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away. And others fell upon the thorns; and the thorns grew up and choked them: and others fell upon the good ground, and yielded fruit, some a hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty. He that hath ears, let him hear.

said unto them in his teaching, Hearken: Behold, the sower went forth to sow: and it came to pass, as he sowed, some *seed* fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured it. And other fell on the rocky *ground*, where it had not much earth; and straightway it sprang up, because it had no deepness of earth: and when the sun was risen, it was scorched; and because it had no root, it withered away. And other fell among the thorns, and the thorns grew up, and choked it, and it yielded no fruit. And others fell into the good ground, and yielded fruit, growing up and increasing; and brought forth, thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold. And he said, Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

Here only a few slight changes are made. Where St. Matthew uses the plural, St. Mark uses the singular, in speaking of the seed, and conversely; while in v. 8 the order is inverted. These changes, and a comparison with St. Luke, prove that a close verbal agreement was not at all essential to a faithful report of the parable. And hence it follows, that one writer must have been partly guided by the other, or else both by a common prototype.

In the account of the question respecting our Lord's authority, there is rather more variation; but still, in the main, there is a minute and verbal agreement.

ST. MATTHEW xxi. 23-27.

And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one question, which if ye tell me, I likewise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or from men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying,

ST. MARK xi. 27-32.

And they come again to Jerusalem: and as he was walking in the temple, there come to him the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders; and they said unto him, By what authority doest thou these things? or who gave thee this authority to do these things? And Jesus said unto them, I will ask of you one question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men? answer me. And they

If we shall say, From heaven, he will say unto us, Why then did ye not believe him? But if we shall say, From men; we fear the multitude; for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus and said, We know not. He also said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say, Why then did ye not believe him? But should we say, From men—they feared the people: for all verily held John to be a prophet. And they answered Jesus and say, We know not. And Jesus saith unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

Another instance of the same, or a still closer resemblance, occurs in the double report of the parable of the Fig-tree, in the Prophecy on the Mount.

ST. MATTHEW xxiv. 32.

Now from the fig-tree learn her parable: when her branch is now become tender, and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh; even so ye also, when ye see all these things, know ye that he is nigh, *even at the doors*. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only.

ST. MARK xiii. 28.

Now from the fig-tree learn her parable: when her branch is now become tender, and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh; even so ye also, when ye see these things coming to pass, know ye that he is nigh, *even at the doors*. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished. Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away. But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

These examples, to which others might be added, are enough to prove that the two gospels could not have been formed independently, and from oral tradition alone. Such a minute agreement, even in the phraseology, and throughout many successive verses, would on this view be inexplicable.

The instances, however, of partial or total divergence, where the same events are narrated, are still more numerous, and disprove, with equal force, the hypothesis of the gospels being derived from some common document. Let us notice a few passages in the order of their occurrence.

The account of Our Lord's Baptism differs almost entirely in the details. The conversation is omitted; the dramatic

form is exchanged for the historical, the word *σχιζόμενος* is substituted for *ἀνεψύχθησαν*, and the voice itself is not given in the same words.

The account of the Temptation is still more varied. St. Mark, who often enlarges, here contracts the narrative to a single verse; while mention is made, here only, of the wild beasts, and only one clause resembles the other gospel.

The opening of our Lord's ministry is very differently given. The formal transfer of its scene to Capernaum from Nazareth is not mentioned. The prophecy of Isaiah is passed over in silence, while the brief passage, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," is considerably enlarged and modified. "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand—Repent, and believe the gospel."

The account of the cure in the Synagogue is an addition, since no mention of it occurs in St. Matthew's gospel; and even the cure of Simon's wife's mother, which follows, is given with fresh circumstances, and a considerable variation in the phrase. The cures of the Leper and the Paralytic, while one or two clauses are retained, are also given with fuller detail, and with several important alterations, in the words of the description. A collation of the two accounts, in this last instance, will show how few of the clauses retain a verbal correspondence.

ST. MATTHEW ix. 2-8.

And behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed.

And Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven. And behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth.

And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? For

ST. MARK ii. 3-12.

And they come, bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy, borne of four. And when they could not come nigh unto him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay. And Jesus seeing their faith saith unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, Why doth this man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, even God? And straightway Jesus, perceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned within

whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven: or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, and take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and departed to his house. But when the multitudes saw it, they were afraid, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.

themselves, saith unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God.

A similar collation, extended through the rest of the gospels, will show how vain it is to explain their resemblances and differences by recourse to the once popular invention, of an earlier and shorter document, from which both were derived by translation or interpolation. For if we were to separate those clauses which retain an almost verbal identity, the common portion thus abstracted would hardly furnish, in three or four events out of a hundred, an unbroken narrative, such as would be required in the most brief and meagre history.¹

We are thus led irresistibly, by the evidence of these partial resemblances, and more numerous variations, when combined with the fact that sixty particulars are the same in both gospels, and given in the same order, to this general conclusion: The two gospels are neither independently formed out of oral traditions, nor composed from a common document; but the later evangelist has made use of the earlier gospel, in his own selection of incidents to record, and has in some cases adopted the very phraseology, while he has usually varied the narrative, and embodied the results of independent and original information.

¹ To see this clearly, we need only consult Mr. Rushbrooke's "Synopticon" (Macmillan, 1880). See also Prof. Salmon's "Introduction," p. 148.—Ed.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE REGULARITY OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

THREE different opinions have been held on the relative date of St. Luke's gospel. Many critics, as Beza, Gomar, Basnage, Walch, Harenberg, and Macknight, have maintained that it was the first written. Others, from the statement of Clement, that the gospels with the genealogies were the earliest, have placed it second in order, next to that of St. Matthew. This is the view of Griesbach, who supposes that the gospel of St Mark was compiled from the two others; and Strauss, in his "Life of Christ," has adopted it implicitly, as an ascertained truth. But the most usual view has always been, that St. Luke's is the third gospel, not only by its place in the canon, but in the actual date of its composition.

Brief summary of varied views about the relative date, the origin and regularity of St. Luke's gospel.

The opinions as to its origin have been equally diverse. Some have endeavoured to explain its features by assuming five or six primitive documents, that were variously used and combined by the three evangelists. Others, as Schleiermacher, have asserted it to be a compilation out of many short fragments, early committed to writing, which the evangelist threw together with little regard to the order of time. A direct inquiry, pursued with due caution, will hardly fail to throw light on the truth or falsehood of these and similar hypotheses of modern criticism, and to discover the real structure of the gospel. Before we examine its direct relation to the two others, it is needful first to determine its regularity, or how far the writer has adhered in it to the real order of events, as they actually occurred.

Here many eminent critics of our own day give their verdict confidently against the evangelist. Thus Neander,

in his "Life of Christ," remarks that "the gospel history did not originate in any design to give a connected account of the public ministry of Christ, as a whole, but grew out of traditional accounts of separate scenes in his history, partly transmitted by word of mouth, and partly in written memoirs. Our three first gospels resulted from the compilation of such separate materials, as Luke himself states in his preface." In like manner Olshausen affirms, that "the three first evangelists, while composing their works, never thought of stating events according to the succession of time in which they occurred." Dr. Robinson observes, much to the same effect, that "the three first gospels can in no sense be regarded as methodical annals. There is often no definite note of time, and we can only proceed upon conjecture." The latter part of St. Luke, he further states, "is almost entirely wanting in chronological arrangement."

Its regularity
maintained
from the
internal evi-
dence.

If, however, we turn from these critical decisions to the statements of the evangelist himself, and consider the most prominent features in both his works, we shall find strong reasons for coming to a directly opposite judgment, and maintaining the substantial, if not the complete, regularity of the whole gospel.

1. The
preface.

I. First of all, the preface supplies very weighty evidence. The writer there states, in few words, the object and plan of his own narrative. The following appears to be the most exact version.

"Forasmuch as many have undertaken to compose a narrative concerning the things which are confidently believed among us, even as they delivered them to us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having traced all things accurately from the very first, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mayest know the certain truth respecting the accounts wherein thou hast been instructed."

The other questions which have been raised on these words will be considered afterwards. For the present, one remark is enough, that the writer announces his purpose of

writing *in order* (καθεξῆς). “The terms ἐξῆς and καθεξῆς,” as Mr. Greswell justly remarks, “are peculiar to St. Luke, in whose writings each of them occurs five times, either as descriptive of the succession of time or of events, but always of a direct, continuous, and orderly succession. There is one instance where he employs the word, as in his Preface, to describe the course of a narrative, and it is plainly regular. ‘But Peter rehearsed the matter from the beginning, and expounded it in order to them,’ (Acts xi. 4). Nor can the meaning be better illustrated than by the passage in Thucydides. ‘These things Thucydides, the Athenian, has written in order, (ἐξῆς) as each happened.’ To write, then, in order, and to write ‘as each happened,’ were in his view synonymous phrases, and why not in the estimation of St. Luke?”¹ A collation of the passages Luke viii. 1; Acts iii. 24; xi. 4; xviii. 23; Luke vii. 11; ix. 37; Acts xxi. 1; xxv. 17; xxvii. 18, seems to establish the justice of this conclusion, since a regular sequence, either of time or place, is clearly intended by the writer in each instance. Hence the preface ought to be expounded in the same sense, and implies that the writer intended to narrate the events, for the most part, in the actual order of their occurrence.

II. THE BOOK OF ACTS yields another argument for the same view. It has the same author with the gospel, of which it may be considered as the continuation. Now its regularity admits of no reasonable dispute. From first to last, hardly one instance of departure from the true order of the events can be discovered. Its three main divisions close with the death of Herod, the mission of Paul and Silas, and the imprisonment of the apostle at Rome, and are strictly successive. The separate events, in the two later divisions, are just as plainly in their exact order, and not a single inversion is to be found. In the first division it is possible that the part referring to Saul’s conversion and ministry, may slightly overlap the previous and following portions. But even this is very doubtful; and if true, it would be quite reconcilable with the laws of regular history, which does not follow the rule of a chronological

2. The Book of Acts.

¹ Greswell, “Harmony of Gospels,” vol. i. p. 8.

table, but merely requires that each connected series of events shall be given in the place which corresponds to the date of its main events. The rest of the book is certainly regular, in the full sense of the term. And hence there must be a strong presumption that the gospel, of which it is a continuation, is also written with a careful regard to historical succession.

3. The main divisions of the gospel.

III. THE MAIN DIVISIONS of the gospel itself clearly answer to the statement of the preface, in its simple and natural meaning. It begins with the message to Zacharias, and the conception of the Baptist, and then records the Incarnation, and the infancy and childhood of Jesus, before it enters on his public ministry. In its middle portion, it evidently places the main events in their true order—our Lord's baptism, his return to Galilee, his removal to Capernaum, the Ordination of the Twelve, their Mission, the Transfiguration, and the later Mission of the Seventy—events of which the real sequence is clearly the same as in the gospel. In its close, and the history of Passion Week, the true order is also plainly observed, unless there may be some exception in the minuter details. And thus the main outlines of the gospel confirm the previous reasoning, and disprove the notion that the evangelist, in spite of the plain words in the preface, paid little or no regard to the order of time.

4. The special notes of time.

IV. THE SPECIAL NOTES OF TIME in this gospel are a further proof that it was designed to be a regular history. The vision to Mary is said to be "in the sixth month," after the previous vision to Zacharias. The visit of Elizabeth to Mary is next stated to have lasted for three months. The birth of John must then have followed, where it is placed, a few weeks later. The circumcision is noted to have been on the eighth, and the presentation on the fortieth day, and the later visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve years. Six marks of time are given, to fix the opening of the Baptist's ministry—the year of Tiberius, the name of the Roman governor, of three tetrarchs, and of the Jewish high-priests. Last of all, the Baptism of Jesus is placed towards the close of John's ministry, and

his age is specified when it occurred. These are not the marks of a composition, where events are grouped arbitrarily together, or where the writer employs unrevised fragments of tradition, without caring to dispose them in their proper places, so as to form a connected and orderly narrative.

V. Let us now pursue the same inquiry more in detail. The first main portion of the gospel to be examined is iii. 1-ix. 50, or from the Baptism of John to the discourse at Capernaum, after the Transfiguration.

5. The regularity of chapters iii.-ix. 50.

This interval, which answers to Nos. 1-46, in the numbered list, contains forty-four particulars in St. Mark, and forty-three in St. Luke. Of these thirty-two are common to both writers. In all these the order is the very same, except one transposition of the simplest kind. The visit of the mother of Jesus, in St. Luke, is mentioned after the parables; in St. Matthew and St. Mark, before them. But since both events were clearly on the same day, and there is no term in St. Luke to fix the precise order, the true succession is easily restored, and involves hardly any breach of strict regularity.

The force of such a coincidence, great in itself, is further increased by the circumstance, that each writer has introduced particulars, not found in the other gospel. Eleven of these are added in St. Luke, and fourteen in St. Mark. An arrangement which is not historical will commonly be disturbed, when fresh materials are introduced into the history. No succession but the true one will allow every event to be inserted, without the risk of its irregularity being detected, and some inconsistency coming to light. Hence the fact that fresh particulars are given by each writer, and still that all the events which are common to both are in the same order, renders the proof of regularity as strong, perhaps, as can possibly be drawn from internal comparison alone.

The greater part of this portion is the very same, in which the first and second gospels vary from each other. From the alarm of Herod, however, to the dispute at Capernaum, the third gospel agrees, not only with the

second gospel, but with the first also, as will be seen from comparing Matt. xiv. 1-xviii. 6, Mark vi. 14-ix. 37, and Luke ix. 7-48.

Here it appears from the numbered syllabus, that nearly half the events are mentioned by all three evangelists: and more than half by two of them, always in the same order. Whilst, though St. Matthew and St. Mark both introduce matter peculiar to themselves, there are no transpositions of any kind. This agreement, in three writers, is a strong evidence that they all observe the true succession of time.

6. The regularity of chapters xviii. 15-xxiv. 52.

VI. There is another portion, where the comparison is still more decisive. In Nos. 49-95, or from the blessing of the young children to the close of the gospels, there are forty particulars common to St. Matthew and St. Mark, and in all these, with one slight exception in the account of the fig-tree, the order is the very same. St. Matthew also has more particulars, not found in the other gospel, and yet their presence has had no effect to disturb the common arrangement of both gospels.

How, then, does St. Luke's gospel bear the comparison in this part of the narrative? The interval, in the second and third gospels, has forty-six or forty-seven particulars, of which thirty-seven are common to both. Yet there are only two examples of apparent inversion, in Nos. 71 and 72, and 79 and 80. In each instance, the two events, which appear in an opposite order, were closely successive, or strictly contemporaneous. The warning to Judas took place just before or after the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the three denials of Peter occurred during our Lord's trial before the high-priest (Mark xiv. 18-25, 64-72; Luke xxii. 19-23, 55-65).

The dispute concerning precedence (Matt. xx. 24-28, Mark x. 41-45, Luke xxii. 24-27) may seem to be a third instance, and to involve a greater inversion. The words in St. Luke resemble so closely those in the other gospels, that many have thought them to refer to the same event. But a close examination seems to justify an opposite opinion, that the occasions were distinct, and that the warning, given a week or ten days earlier, was repeated at

the time of the Last Supper. For the words, Luke xxii. 27, which are not found in the earlier gospels, appear to be a direct allusion to the event recorded by St. John, xiii. 1-10, when Jesus washed the feet of his disciples.

Thus it appears that the third gospel, both in its earlier and later portions, has adhered closely to the order of time. Out of seventy events that are common to it with the second gospel, there are only three cases of very slight transposition, and each in the case of events, either strictly contemporary, or occurring on the same day or hour, in immediate succession.

To estimate the force of this argument, we have only to apply the laws of probability. The events, until our Lord's return from Galilee, fix their own order, and may be excluded from the comparison. There remain, from that return to the dispute at Capernaum, Nos. 7-45, twenty-seven particulars common to both gospels. Let us admit that every pair, on the average, are so closely linked together that they could not easily be parted, or that only thirteen would admit, in irregular narratives, of a free transposition. The chance will then be 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13, or more than 6,000 millions to one against the actual agreement, unless one has copied the other, or both have adhered to the true order. If we repeat the same inquiry in the later portion, Nos. 47-93, and reduce the thirty-seven instances, where all the writers agree in their arrangement, to ten only, because the order is here less arbitrary, the chances against such coincidence, in irregular narratives, would be more than ten millions of millions to one. It seems thus to be almost mathematically certain, either that the later gospel adopted the order of its predecessors, or that each adhered to the true succession of the events themselves.

VII. The irregularity of St. Luke, if it exist at all, must thus be limited to the middle portion, ix. 51-xviii. 14, or from the journey through Samaria to the parable of the Publican. Even if inversions were proved to exist in these chapters, two-thirds of the whole have been shown to answer the description in the preface. They are not a

7. The regularity of chapters ix. 51-xviii. 14.

cento of fragments, thrown loosely together, but an orderly and connected narrative. The difficulties, however, in this middle portion require a fuller examination.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

At this point I have deemed it right to interrupt my father's argument, and I think I have his sanction for so doing. In a late MS., speaking of the "*Horæ Evangelicæ*," as a whole, he says: "My own work, which appeared twenty-seven years ago, needs revision throughout, and many secondary corrections, especially in the part that bears on the structure of the third gospel, but I am increasingly convinced of the truth and demonstrable certainty of its main outline, even in those parts which have been controverted, or silently rejected by some more recent critics."

In view of this statement, it seems hardly fair to present again arguments which in points of detail, at least, had certainly ceased to bring conviction to my father's mind. At the same time I do not like to leave an absolute lacuna, and I have no means of ascertaining with assurance in what direction my father had modified his views. I have thought it best to state as briefly as possible the conclusions at which I have myself arrived after a very careful study. I think they will be found to harmonize exactly with all the main contentions of my father's work: and I have even some indications that they are on the lines of his own later studies. The English translation of Wieseler's "*Synopsis*" appeared after the publication of the "*Horæ Evangelicæ*." My father expressly mentions it among the books the careful study of which had modified his views, and while he held that in some great points he had gone wonderfully astray, he spoke with admiration of his skill and acumen in the details of criticism. Perhaps in no portion of his work is this acumen more discernible than in the section dealing with these very chapters. I have adopted (with Bishop Ellicott¹ and others), his main contention, that St. Luke refers in these chapters to more

¹ "Historical Lectures," vi. p. 237.

journeys than one; but I associate the Mission of the Seventy with the Feast of Dedication, and not of Tabernacles. The publicity of that Mission seems inconsistent with the statement of St. John, "that he went up not openly, but as it were in secret" (St. John vii. 10), and Wieseler's objection that if our Lord had left Judæa between the Feast of Tabernacles and of Dedication, St. John must certainly have mentioned it, has no great weight. We cannot determine *à priori* what each evangelist must say or must omit.

I will proceed, then, to state my own impressions, gathered in the main from a close comparison of the gospels themselves, though I acknowledge many obligations to my father,¹ to Wieseler, to Ellicott, and Edersheim. In a question so intricate one cannot arrive at more than probability; but a solution not inconsistent with facts, even although we cannot be quite sure it is the right one, may at least be of service in proving that the gospel narratives are not antagonistic and not irreconcilable.

(1) St. Luke ix. 51. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

My father said:

"The third gospel has been already shown to be regular from the Baptism of John to the Dispute at Capernaum (iii. 1-ix. 50), and again from the blessing of the little children, where it rejoins the two others, to the close (xviii. 15-xxiv. 53). The middle portion, if also regular, must be included within these limits of time, or relate to the last half year of our Saviour's ministry.

"Now the opening verse agrees evidently with this conception of the true place of the narrative, and apparently refers the whole to the last journey to Jerusalem. . . . So far as this verse can be a key to the structure, the history from this point must belong to that final journey, which

¹ A pencil note in his copy of Wieseler leads me to think that at least in the first step of my harmony I have the sanction of his later views.

issued first in our Lord's death, and then in his resurrection and ascension into glory" (H. E., p. 37).

So wrote my father in 1851, but I have reason to believe he modified his views; and, indeed, the words, "*must* belong to that final journey," etc., are even then somewhat modified by the "*apparently* refers" of the preceding sentence.

We may then fairly ask a greater latitude of reference. The word *συμπληροῦσθαι*, it appears to me, refers backward to the last mention of Jerusalem, and what was that? Upon the Mount of the Transfiguration (probably Mount Hermon) Moses and Elias appeared with him in glory, and spake of his decease that he should accomplish at Jerusalem (*πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*). That was the crisis of his ministry; that was the Father's witness to what, apart from us and our redemption, had been its fitting close. A life so holy had deserved the crown. But ere he would take it, in order that prophecy might be fulfilled, and that we men might be redeemed, the cross must intervene. Like St. Paul in the later history, who, knowing by the witness of the Spirit that bonds awaited him, still pressed towards Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 11-14), so now did Jesus by his own act and deed seek to fulfil the voice of prophecy, and that, although it led him to a cruel death. The whole remaining portion of his ministry is a continual pressing forward to that end. Jerusalem is ever in the forefront of his thoughts. Three times he came to it, or its immediate neighbourhood, although at an earlier period he had absented himself for a period of eighteen months on account of the hostility displayed to him, and although the hostility grew ever day by day more deadly than before. Two strong forces ruled his movements and labours at this period. There was the strong attraction that drew him to Jerusalem where he was ready to be offered, and there was the strong repulsion occasioned by the growing hatred of his enemies, that once and again drove him back, because although so willing to be offered, he yet would not forestall the destined day, because his hour had not yet come. In a wide and general sense you might aver of the whole period of six months, from October

to the Passover, that he "steadfastly set his face towards Jerusalem." The earlier synoptists give us what happened in the journey from Hermon to Capernaum—a time of special preparation for his followers. St. John gives us what happened in the holy city and its neighbourhood. St. Luke what happened on the diverse journeyings. Of these, helped by St. John, we may detect certainly three before the final Passover. (1) The visit at the Feast of Tabernacles; (2) the visit at the Feast of Dedication; (3) the visit to Bethany, when Lazarus was raised.

It seems to me that the verses, St. Luke ix. 51-62, answer to the first of these visits, and correspond with St. John vii. 1-9.

There is but one apparent contradiction, which vanishes on closer scrutiny. There are some interesting points of contact.

It might appear at first sight that the expression, "My time is not yet come," and the reluctance of our Lord to yield to his brethren's importunities and manifest himself, was not in harmony with St. Luke's words about the steadfast setting of his face towards Jerusalem. The Revisers, however, by their translation of St. Luke ix. 51, bring into greater prominence a hidden harmony. "My time or opportunity is *not yet* come," said Jesus in St. John, yet he delayed for a few days only his journey to Jerusalem. St. Luke had said, "And it came to pass when the days were *wellnigh come* that he should be received up, he steadfastly set his face to journey towards Jerusalem." The οὐπω of St. John might almost seem to be an explanation of the συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας of the earlier evangelist, the καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη in the very form of its expression exactly answers to καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστήριξε. St. Luke declares to us our Lord's persistent purpose. St. John his passing rebuff to the impertinent and unbelieving pressure that his brethren put on him. There is no contradiction beyond what is common in ordinary life and action, where a man with a consistent aim and purpose may often seem to others more eager and less clear-sighted than himself, to hesitate and vacillate. The statesman

who desires some great reform, but desires, too, to carry the whole nation along with him, may seem to eager partisans or captious critics to be holding back, although posterity may judge aright his dominant desire. We have a kindred instance in our Lord's own life—"Woman, mine hour is not yet come"—and yet he turned the water into wine. His purpose did not fail. Thus the objection changes to a mark of harmony. When we have got this clue the rest is easy. He journeys through Samaria, not the frequented route. He journeys secretly, and tries to arrange for his accommodation privately. The only disciples mentioned as with him are James and John, his own believing relatives. He rebukes the brothers who desire a display of vengeance. He seeks another village. The Samaritans refuse him because he is going to Jerusalem. There would be special reason if this was at the season of the Feast. Those who would follow in his company meet with but scant encouragement. "Go thou away and preach the kingdom"—not "Come thou and follow me." The journey was plainly one of rejection, privation, and danger. The teaching at the feast thereafter (St. John vii.-viii.) is fully in accordance therewith. The thought of his impending suffering is ever with him. Many attempts are made to take him, which fail, because his hour had not yet come, or as St. Luke would say, the days were but fulfilling, not fulfilled; and the angry taunt of the Jews refers back to his journeying, "Say we not well that thou art a *Samaritan*, and hast a devil?" (St. John viii. 48.) This would be natural had he just journeyed through Samaria. Thus all fits in. The preaching of the Seventy must belong to a later period—a journey of publicity, and it seems natural to place it before the Feast of Dedication. This brings me to my second point of harmony.

(2) St. Luke x. 1-42, I place between St. John x. 21 and 22.

St. John, according to his wont, devotes himself to the Judæan ministry, and carries on the Saviour's teaching concerning himself as the Good Shepherd of the sheep.

But he is careful to mention the distinctness of the two occasions, and to let us know that he has passed two months in perfect silence. St. Luke supplies the gap. The journey to the Feast of Tabernacles was secret, and therefore it allowed no formal leave-taking. Our Lord had acted himself on the advice he gave his would-be follower, who asked, "Let me first bid them farewell which are at home at my house." But now that he was about to remove from Galilee, and spend his time almost entirely between Perea and Jerusalem, some public announcement of the closing of the day of grace in that northern neighbourhood might be expected, and we find it. The characteristic of the former journey was the closest secrecy; this is distinguished by its wide publicity.

"After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place whither he himself would come." The commission was not to make secret preparations for his own reception, as in the case of the Samaritans, but to preach openly, and to work the most startling miracles. The opening words of the charge to them, "Behold, I send you forth as lambs in the midst of wolves," carry us back not merely or mainly to the similar charge to the Twelve, but also to his recent teaching at the Feast of Tabernacles, where he had spoken both of sheep and wolves. His action now exactly corresponds with his words then. "When he hath put forth all his own, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice." (R. V. St. John x. 4.) He first put forth the Seventy, and then, when they had brought him their report, he went before them, and they followed him. The wider mission of the Seventy was typical of the conversion of those other sheep not of this fold whom also he must bring. As he sent them out he uttered his last warning to Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum, the central cities of the Galilean ministry; and his words against Capernaum seem to be coloured by the teaching he had given his disciples there. (Cf. Luke x. 15, 16, and Mark ix. 35-37.)

We may suppose that when he had sent them out, he

followed them after a little interval, and that on their return they would find him in Perea. His discourse to them there reminds us of his teaching at Jerusalem at the preceding feast: especially compare, "All things are delivered to me of my Father, and no man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him" (St. Luke x. 22), and "I am the Good Shepherd. I know my own, and mine own know me, even as the Father knoweth me and I know the Father." (St. John x. 14, 15.)

Then follows the question of the lawyer, and the parable of the Good Samaritan.¹ Upon the view that I am here maintaining, with what entire fitness it falls in with the course of his journeying—most likely it was uttered in the neighbourhood of Jericho—there is a chronological as well as a moral sequence in the successive incidents, which lead us from Capernaum to Bethany before the Feast of Dedication.

It may have been the first acquaintance of the sisters with our Lord: it may have been, as Edersheim suggests, that two of the Seventy had visited the house, and so prepared them to receive him, and that the brother Lazarus at first was absent in the city for the Feast. We know the life of Jesus was in danger in the Temple, "They took up stones to throw at him." He found in Bethany, most likely then for the first time, the safe retreat to which he afterwards recurred so gladly at the Passover. Nay more than so. May we not trace a closer parallel? For in the Temple Jesus said, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand;" and in the home at Bethany, perhaps that very night, we read that Mary sat at Jesus' feet, and listened to his word: that is, she proved herself one of the sheep of whom he spoke, and Jesus said to her, "Mary hath chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her." Although the terms are different, the promise of security is just the same.

¹ Cf. Blunt's "Scriptural Coincidences," Part IV. xxx. p. 313.

Again, when the disciples next returned to Bethany, they said (St. John xi. 8), "Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee, and goest thou thither again?" The question, it is true, is apposite in any case, but it is doubly apposite if the attempted stoning in the Temple was so connected in the minds of the disciples with Jesus' first acquaintance with that village home.

3. So far the harmony is simple. It is not quite so easy to determine at what point in St. Luke's narrative the visit to Bethany, when Lazarus was raised, must be inserted. Probably the chapters St. Luke xi.-xiii., precede the miracle. The chapters xiv.-xvii. 10, which contain no notes of movement or of journeying, may with much reason be assigned to the prolonged stay at Ephraim. The section xvii. 11-xviii. 10, gives incidents peculiar to St. Luke in the early part of the last journey to the Passover.

(a) We will deal first with the section between the Feast of Dedication and Miracle at Bethany. St. John assures us (x. 39-42), "that Jesus went away again beyond Jordan to the place where John was at first baptizing, and many believed on him there." The place is probably Bethabara, or Bethany if that be the true reading, beyond Jordan, where John is mentioned as baptizing (St. John i. 28). Bethabara, or Bethany, may both mean by their derivation "the house of shipping." Bethabara more likely means "house of the ford." It is the scene where Ephraim slew Oreb and Zeeb, and has been identified by Conder¹ in a spot east of Jordan, only twenty-two miles from Cana in Galilee. Here then our Lord, according to St. John, retired. What do we read in St. Luke? First his disciples come to him and ask, as he was praying in a certain place, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples." The coincidence, although oblique, is very perfect.

(β) Again, St. John mentions, "Many believed on him there," and in this section of St. Luke we read (xi. 29), "And when the people were gathered thick together;" (xii. 1) "And in the meantime when there were gathered together an innumerable multitude of people, insomuch

¹ "Tent Life in Palestine," vol. ii. p. 17, and p. 64.

that they trod one upon another ;” (xiii. 17) “ And when he had said these things all his adversaries were ashamed, and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.”

The whole narrative gives the idea of crowded, eager, and successful work ; so much so that the Pharisees were furnished with their future accusation, “ He stirreth up the people, beginning from Galilee,” and his sanguine followers were led to ask, “ Lord, are there few that be saved ?” (xiii. 23.)

(γ) Again, this section is remarkable for many startling points of resemblance with Christ’s own early Galilean teaching. It provides most weapons to those who contend that the whole arrangement is confused and unchronological. But it is certain that in the course of our Lord’s ministry, the same objections would be raised over and over again, the same old truths would be continually reinforced. Under the present circumstances there was special reason, although our Lord was in Peræa : many from Galilee would join the crowds of listeners. It was his last opportunity of bringing home to them the doctrine he had ever taught, and so he made the fullest use of it.

(δ) St. Luke xiii. 22, “ He went through the towns and villages, journeying toward Jerusalem,” most likely marks the end of the sojourn at Bethabara ; the recommencement of the journey to Judæa. The message from the Pharisees concerning Herod (St. Luke xiii. 31) is probably closely coincident with the message, so different in character, from Mary and Martha at Bethany (St. John xi. 3). The dominions of Herod extended along the whole east of the Jordan, within a day of Bethany. Our Lord’s abiding two days still in the same place where he was would thus obtain a fuller explanation. The contradiction between *abiding* (St. John xi. 6) and *walking* (St. Luke xiii. 33) is more apparent than real. For though the Lord stayed where he was, they were not days of idleness but days of active work ; and if the word “ abode ” (St. John xi. 6) presents a seeming contradiction, the words, “ If a man walk in the day he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man

walk in the night he stumbleth, because the light is not in him" (St. John xi. 10, 11), have greater weight upon the other side.

The expression, "The third day I am perfected," has often perplexed the student of the Scriptures. But what if it refers to the arrival at Bethany? In that case it would mean in its primary sense, "The third day brings the completion of my present journey;" but there remained a deeper thought beyond, the miracle at Bethany sealed the determination of the Sanhedrim to take his life. "It is expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." That was the verdict of Jerusalem.

(ε) This exegesis, in itself probable, is strikingly borne out by a comparison of Luke xiii. 22, with 34, 35. "The Lord was journeying toward Jerusalem," v. 22; he said of its inhabitants, v. 35, "Ye shall not see me until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." That time, we know, did not come till the final Passover (St. Luke xix. 38). Here, then, we have a journey to Jerusalem in which he did not enter it. And such exactly was the journey that ended at the house in Bethany, and issued in the miracle of raising Lazarus.¹

4. The period remaining must be divided between the stay at Ephraim, and the journey thence by way of Peræa to Jerusalem. The starting-point for the journey is probably St. Luke xvii. 11.

"And it came to pass as he went to Jerusalem that he passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee." The interpretation of this verse must be largely affected by the geographical position of Ephraim. If it was placed, according to the common notion, in the north-east of Judæa, close to the borders of Samaria, we must understand that Jesus passed once more through Samaria, and crossed the Jordan near the borders of Galilee, to pass on with the Galilean pilgrims. If, as Dr. Edersheim² suggests, it was far north near the Peræan wilderness, we need only suppose a little

¹ Cf. Wieseler, "Synopsis," Eng. trans., p. 293.

² "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," vol. ii. pp. 127, 326.

detour toward Ænon, near Salim, one of the centres of the Baptist's labours, to give the circumstances needful for the incident of the ten lepers. The question of the Pharisees, "When shall the Kingdom of God come?" (St. Luke xvii. 20) might well have been suggested by a visit to the scenes where John the great Forerunner had proclaimed the kingdom.

Thus, without insisting on the demonstrable certainty of every point, I think we may claim to have presented upon the whole a simple and consistent view of the chronology, and to conclude in the words of my father: "The statement of St. Luke in his preface is verified here as in the rest of his gospel, and he is shown to have written the events of our Lord's ministry, as he promised to Theophilus, in orderly succession."

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS COMPARED
WITH ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK. GENERAL ARGUMENTS.

THE regularity of the third gospel, in two of its main portions, has now been clearly proved ; and has been shown to be highly probable, even in that middle portion which has often been held to establish an opposite view. The notion of Schleiermacher and others, that it has been compiled loosely from separate fragments, is found to be inconsistent with the most prominent facts in the comparison of the three gospels. We may now safely regard it as one connected whole, and inquire into its relative date, with reference to St. Matthew's and St. Mark's narratives.

Various views
that have been
held.

On this subject, also, opinions have differed widely. Many writers, as Beza, Gomar, Harenberg, Vogel, and Macknight, have maintained that St. Luke's is really the first gospel in point of time. Others place it second, and suppose that St. Mark compiled his own from the two others. Olshausen suggests that some fragments of it existed before St. Mark, and were used by him, though as a whole, he places it later. A recent author¹ has advanced the opinion that it is later than St. Matthew, and also than an Aramaic form of St. Mark, which was the original gospel of St. Peter ; but that St. Mark's Greek gospel was published after it, and was simply a translation. The most usual opinion, however, places St. Luke after the two others, while some conceive that its origin was quite independent of them, and others that the writer made free use of their histories.²

¹ Mr. Smith, of Jordanhill.

² Dean Alford says: "Different hypotheses of the mutual inter-

Griesbach's untenable.
St. Mark not a compilation from St. Matthew and St. Luke.

Let us first examine briefly those views which are least usual, and appear to be most easily disproved. The first is the opinion of Griesbach, that St. Mark's gospel is a mere compilation from the two earlier narratives of St. Luke and St. Matthew. Dr. Strauss, in his "Life of Jesus," reasons on this assumption as a certain truth (i. 59). Yet, perhaps, of all the hypotheses, this is the most untenable.

The sum of the argument may be stated in few words. The whole of St. Mark's gospel, except twenty-four verses, is contained in one of the two others. Consequently, it might be compiled from them, and whoever believes that a later evangelist copied from the earlier, must conclude

dependence of the three have been made, embracing every possible permutation of their order.

"1. That Matthew wrote first—that Mark used his gospel—and then Luke both these—is held by Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, Townson, Hug, etc., and Greswell, who advances and sometimes maintains with considerable ingenuity the hypothesis of a *supplemental* relation of the three taken in order.

"2. Matthew, Luke, Mark. So Griesbach, Fritzsche, Meyer, De Wette, and others.

"3. Mark, Matthew, Luke. So Storr and others, and recently Mr. Smith, of Jordanhill.

"4. Mark, Luke, Matthew. So Weisse, Wilke, Hitzig, etc.

[Dr. Westcott appears to adopt in a modified form this view.—ED.]

"5. Luke, Matthew, Mark. So Büsching and Evanson.

"6. Luke, Mark, Matthew. So Vögel."

The fact that so many varying views have been held, at first sight might appear conclusive evidence against the truth of any supplemental theory. It led the late Archbishop Thomson not to expect much fruit from the discussion, and to wonder that so much time and learning had been spent upon it. Prof. Salmon, on the other hand, whilst admitting the difficulties to be great, vindicates stoutly for the supplemental theorists the right of hearing.

The argument from the variety of view appears to be stronger than it really is. To my mind it only proves that something may be said for every form of connection, and that so great is the interest excited by our gospels, that wherever something can be found to be said for any view whatever of their origin, some able, clever man will certainly be found to say it. To myself it would appear that the third view in Dean Alford's list is the only really formidable rival to the one that my father, following Greswell, has maintained, and that the balance of the probabilities is on my father's side.—ED.

that such was its real origin. If the writer drew from any other source, how are we to explain the fact that all, except twenty-four verses, is found in their gospels only?

It is clear, however, that the same fact may be equally explained in a different way. If St. Luke wrote after both the others, and was careful to insert most of the incidents peculiar to the shorter and less familiar gospel, the very same result would follow. Nearly every part of St. Mark would then be found, either in the earlier or later gospel. To decide between the two explanations, we must consider which is more probable in itself, and will account for special features in the relation they bear to each other.

And first the question must arise—What could be the possible motive for the supposed compilation? The two gospels, from which it would be made, must have been of authority in the Church, and actually in circulation. The mere introduction of two cures, of a single parable, and a few brief passages of the same kind, could never be the main reason for entering on a work, in the view of the writer himself, so important as a formal narrative of our Lord's ministry. Whatever the source from which these twenty-four verses were derived, it is impossible to believe that they would supply him with such scanty materials only, wherewith to enrich his narrative, and give it a distinct and individual importance to the Church of Christ.

On the other hand, if the gospel of St. Luke followed the two others, a sufficient motive for the composition of each is readily found. St. Mark, compared with St. Matthew, has not only a considerable amount of original matter, but a distinct character and object, to amplify the details of the narrative, while abridging the discourses, and at the same time, to remove transpositions, and restore the true order of time. St. Luke's again, besides adopting the rectified order of the second gospel, incorporating some of its graphic details, and most of its peculiar incidents, has so much that is peculiarly its own, as to form a sufficient and weighty reason for its publication. All is consistent and natural on this view, while on the other, the composition of

St. Mark's gospel admits of no reasonable explication. For its main excellence is the vividness of its details, which indicates the presence of an eye-witness, and is quite inconsistent with the notion, that it is a mere compilation.

But another reason, equally decisive against Griesbach's hypothesis, will be found in a close observation of those parts of the second gospel, which are wanting in the first, and which one of the two later evangelists may be supposed to have borrowed from the other. These are mainly the following, Mark i. 21-28, 35-39; iii. 13-19; ix. 38-40; xii. 38-44, besides the closer agreement in several passages common to the three gospels, as the account of the demoniac of Gadara, and the raising of the daughter of Jairus.

Now in the first of these passages, if St. Mark had borrowed additional incidents from St. Luke, while following the general outline of St. Matthew, he would most naturally have copied or abridged the account, in the third gospel, of the visit to Nazareth, which appears there in close connection with the abode at Capernaum, and the first act of dispossession. On the other view of the succession, nothing can be more simple and natural than their relation to each other. St. Mark, restoring the cure in Simon's house to its true order, is led to mention the cure in the synagogue, which took place immediately before it; while St. Luke goes still further in supplying the connecting links of the narrative, and describes that visit to Nazareth, implied in Matt. iv. 13, which led to the first public exercise of our Lord's ministry at Capernaum.

The next passages which nearly correspond, while absent in Matthew, are Mark iii. 13-19, Luke vi. 12-17. In St. Mark, this wears the appearance of a simple link in the chain of St. Matthew's narrative, xii. 15-24, pointing out the time when the apostles were ordained, as distinct from that of their mission; and it still leaves a considerable interval, before the occurrence of the discourse on blasphemy. If St. Mark had borrowed from St. Luke, he would naturally have introduced one or more of the other incidents in the third gospel, the cure of the Centurion's servant, the raising

of the Widow's son at Nain, or the message of the Baptist, or the attendance of the Galilean women. Since he has passed all these by in silence, it must be far more probable that St. Luke has here given a second supplement of larger extent, than that St. Mark has selected only a few verses from this portion of Luke, and neglected other incidents of higher interest.

Again, the most distinctive portion of St. Luke's gospel is contained in the middle chapters, ix. 51-xviii. 14, which follow after the dispute at Capernaum, and the reply to the address of John. That address itself is given by both evangelists, almost in the same words, and either might have borrowed it from the other. But if St. Mark merely compiled his gospel from the two others, how is it that he entirely passes over these intervening chapters, and leaves the same hiatus here as the first gospel? This is a cardinal feature in the comparison, and decisively refutes the hypothesis, that the second gospel has been compiled from the two others; since there is not one verse in it which answers to the most characteristic portion of St. Luke. On this ground alone, Olshausen is led to admit that the view of Griesbach is quite untenable.

The same feature appears in the narrative of the Crucifixion. The incidents peculiar to St. Luke, compared with St. Matthew, the appearance of the angel in the garden, the trial before Herod, and the penitent thief, are none of them found in St. Mark's gospel, and hence a further proof that this was not compiled from the two others.

Olshausen, however, has supposed that one or two sections of St. Luke, though not the whole gospel, were earlier than St. Mark, and used by him in his own narrative. This remark seems afterwards limited to the section, Luke x. 3-9, in which the harmony is said to be specially apparent. Yet when we compare the mission of the Twelve in St. Mark with the mission of the Twelve and of the Seventy in St. Luke (Mark vi. 7-13; Luke ix. 1-6, x. 1-12), the two former agree in about ten clauses, and the first and third in about three only. The hypothesis, therefore, that St. Mark has borrowed his account of the mission of the

Olshausen's
theory not
tenable.
St. Luke is
later than
St. Mark.

Twelve from Luke's account of the later mission of the Seventy, highly improbable in itself, becomes utterly impossible when the passages are closely examined. The relation is fully explained, if we suppose that St. Luke followed St. Mark in the mission of the Twelve, but reserved one or two sentences, which were twice uttered, that he might give them on their second occurrence, in the mission of the Seventy, which he alone has placed on record.

St. Luke is
later than
St. Matthew.
General
arguments.

We may now return to the main question, the comparative priority of St. Luke and St. Matthew. In the present chapter the general arguments will be considered, several of which have been claimed, with equal confidence, in favour of the two opposite views, and will therefore call for double caution in the inquiry.

(1) The words
of the preface.

1. The words of the preface have been urged by¹ Macknight and others, as a strong reason for the opinion that St. Luke's gospel was the first written. The many writings alluded to cannot, he says, denote the gospels of Matthew and Mark; and still, when St. Luke was referring to histories of our Lord, previously written, he could not pass over these in silence, if he were aware of their existence. Still less could he mix them with apocryphal and defective accounts in one common description, to their serious disparagement. Hence his gospel must have been composed earlier than theirs, or at least before he was aware of their existence.

The reply of Dr. Townson is as follows.² The two other gospels are referred to in the second clause of the preface, for the word there used applies equally to written and oral tradition. Also St. Luke had no motive for naming them more fully, since he could neither mean to use them as vouchers for his facts, nor to justify his work by their example, and he could not make an encomium on their gospels, without starting inquiries into the motives of his own, quite inconsistent, in the reply they would need, with the brevity and modesty of his introduction. Hug has carried this view still further, and offers the following paraphrase. "Many have composed histories of the actions of

¹ "Harmony of Gospels," vol. i. pp. 31, 32.

² "Discourses," p. 197 and following.

our Lord, such as those which the eye-witnesses and ministers of the doctrine have published. It will therefore be permitted me also to enumerate the events for thee, according to their succession, that thou mayest be acquainted with the truth and certainty of the different relations delivered to thee; especially as I have carefully followed the events on their theatre, when they began to be developed.”¹

The contrast of these explications proves the need of caution in all reasonings from the words of the preface. The words of the preface run thus: Ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, καθὼς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, ἔδοξε καὶ μοί, etc. The following remarks, however, seem to make it probable that St. Luke here implies his actual acquaintance with the two other gospels.

Refer probably to gospels of Matthew and Mark.

First, the clause respecting the tradition of eye-witnesses refers in some way to the many compilations, and is not linked directly with St. Luke's own work, which is first mentioned in the clause that follows. Three meanings are possible; that the confident belief of Christians was guided by those reports of the eye-witnesses; that the many narratives were based on the oral tradition of the apostles: or lastly, that their plan was borrowed from actual narratives, given by eye-witnesses and ministers of the word.

The first view, which Olshausen adopts, is hardly consistent with the structure of the original words. The order should then have been (τῶν πραγμάτων, τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, καθὼς παρέδοσαν κ. τ. λ., πεπληροφορημένων.) As they now stand, the second clause must refer to the leading fact or idea of the first, ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι, and not belong to the dependent participle πεπληροφορημένων at its close. It is the composition of the narratives, and not the confident belief of Christians, of which the rule and manner are defined.

The two other constructions, in point of grammar, are

¹ Hug's "Introd.," Eng. trans., vol. ii. p. 135 following, specially p. 144.

equally admissible. The choice will depend either on historical probability, or on the purpose of the apology.

If by the words of St. Luke's preface oral traditions alone are meant, the sequence of the early records of Christianity will be as follows. First, many apocryphal and imperfect gospels, now lost and forgotten. Secondly, the narrative of one who was neither an eye-witness nor an early minister of the word, but learned the facts at second hand. Thirdly, the gospel of St. Matthew, an eye-witness, and one of the Twelve. We must then suppose that the need of a written account had become so manifest as to lead to the composition of many works, before any of the eye-witnesses thought fit to place the facts on record, and thereby to secure the Church against the spread of falsehoods; and that even after they appeared, a writer of secondary and more remote authority was left to supply the want, while all the apostles and early companions of the Lord maintained a dead silence with regard to any written testimony. Such an opinion is hard to reconcile with the wisdom of inspired teachers, or with the natural instincts of the human heart. The eye-witnesses of such works could not but speak, and when once there was need and occasion for written teaching, surely they could not but write of those great things which they had seen and heard.

On the other view we have this order. First, the gospel of St. Matthew, by one of the Twelve, having the double authority of an eye-witness and an inspired ruler of the Church. Next, that of St. Mark, under the guidance of another apostle, the foremost of the Twelve, in which further and more graphic details were supplied with like authority. Thirdly, many narratives of a similar kind, composed with reference to the wants of new circles of converts, as the gospel spread more widely, and in which other traditional facts were imperfectly set forth, though designed to meet a real want of the Church of Christ. Fourthly, the gospel of St. Luke, which fulfilled the idea of a gospel, framed by accurate investigation, in contrast to the immediate testimony of eye-witnesses, and thus answered the objects the others failed to satisfy, while it became an im-

portant supplement to the two gospels that had already appeared.

On this view the apology is perhaps even more suitable than on the other. If no authentic gospel had yet been published, the apostles would seem, either purposely to have deferred the work, and then to attempt it would be to impugn their wisdom or zeal ; or else to have resigned it to others, and no reference to imperfect narratives would then be required, to justify a well-qualified writer in supplying a clear want of the Church of Christ. But if two gospels, or even one only, were already extant, some explanation would seem required of the motives for writing another. In this case, the composition of many other narratives on their model would prove the desire for still fuller information, while the fact that these were inaccurate would justify St. Luke in publishing another account, supplementary to the two earlier gospels, and more authentic and complete than the narratives to which he alludes.

Again, the term eye-witness, which occurs here only, is very appropriate if referred to St. Matthew, one of the twelve apostles. The other term, *ὁπηρέτης*, is also rare in the New Testament, and is applied by St. Luke elsewhere to two Christian teachers only, the apostle Paul, and John Mark, the traditional writer of the second gospel (Acts xxvi. 16, xiii. 5). Hence a tacit reference to each gospel is no improbable interpretation. The eye-witnesses were all ministers of the word ; but all the ministers of the word were not eye-witnesses. Without distinguishing the terms too widely, or excluding a reference to the oral teaching of the apostles and their companions, it seems not unlikely that the double phrase may contain an implied allusion to the authors of the two first canonical gospels.

But how could it be a motive for the composition, in this case, that Theophilus might know the certainty of the things wherein he had been instructed ? With regard to Theophilus himself, it is probable that his instruction hitherto had been by oral teaching only. He needed, then, more distinct information in a written form ; and the evangelist was able to furnish it in the very shape and manner

which the case required. With reference to the Church at large, the additional narratives were a proof that the two authentic gospels had not exhausted the fund of truth actually current among Christians, and which it was desirable to embody in a permanent form. Accurate knowledge, careful investigation, and a Divine call to the task, were alone needed to justify a further narrative, and of all these St. Luke was consciously in possession. The very same reasons which have made the work a lasting benefit to the Church, would clearly warrant its composition, even although the writer were fully aware that two other gospels were already written.

(2) St. Luke's fuller account of our Lord's infancy: no argument of his priority.

II. The gospel of St. Luke, compared with that of St. Matthew, gives a still fuller account of our Lord's infancy. This also has been thought a sign of its priority. Especially it has been urged that St. Matthew, had he written earlier, would have given the true genealogy, and not merely that of Joseph, our Lord's supposed father. St. Luke's accurate mention of dates and intervals in these chapters is alleged in proof of the same opinion. In the other gospels, it is said, there is scarcely a single date to fix the time of any event, a circumstance very improbable, if they were composed earlier.

An opposite conclusion, however, seems more reasonable. A gospel, written early for Jewish Christians, would be likely to select those facts in our Lord's infancy, which proved the fulfilment of the Jewish prophecies, his descent from David, and his birth at Bethlehem. Just so it is in St. Matthew's gospel, which begins with the legal genealogy from Abraham and David, and then confirms the birth at Bethlehem by a fact, public in its nature, which must have been notorious at Jerusalem. St. Luke, on the contrary, gives details in exact and careful succession; the very way in which an investigator, who was not an eye-witness, and who wrote for converts at a distance both in time and place, might be expected to compose. His mention of dates and intervals is certainly an argument rather for the later than the earlier origin of the work.

A similar remark applies to the genealogies. Assuming

for the present that the one in St. Luke is really that of Mary, this would rather evince its later origin. The main purpose of the genealogies must have been practical, to prove that Jesus was the promised Son of David. With unbelievers this would be effected only by his legal genealogy, through Joseph his reputed father, and with believers, by his actual descent, through Mary his real mother. Hence the former would be suitable in an earlier gospel, designed for the conversion of the Jews, but the latter in a subsequent narrative, intended for the instruction of believing converts among the Gentiles.

III. Another difference between St. Matthew and St. Luke consists in the comparative development of the earlier part of our Lord's public ministry. From the Baptism of John to the Discourse at Capernaum, Matt. iii.-xviii. Luke iii.-ix. 50, there are in the former sixteen chapters, and in the latter less than seven, or 570 and 326 verses respectively. In other words, the length of this portion, in St. Luke, is only three-fifths of that which it occupies in the other gospel. It is natural to suppose that an earlier writer would dwell rather on the former part of our Lord's long-continued labours, and that another, whose memoir was, in a certain sense, supplementary, would compress it in the parts already recorded, and give a fuller development to the later and omitted portions. And, accordingly, the third gospel, while its total length is greater even than St. Matthew's, and nearly double that of St. Mark, is actually, between these limits, more brief than the narrative contained in the second gospel.

IV. St. Matthew, again, compared with St. Luke, is more copious in doctrinal discourses, while in St. Luke the incidents are more numerous. It is evident that the longer discourses would be likely to be soonest forgotten in the keeping of mere tradition, while miracles and striking incidents would survive in the memory of our Lord's disciples, or of those who heard them from the lips of the apostles. There is thus a strong presumption from this feature of St. Matthew's gospel, exemplified in the Sermon on the Mount, the Apostolic Commission, the Parables, the Discourse on

(3) Comparative development of the earlier part of our Lord's public ministry.

(4) St. Matthew's fulness in doctrinal discourses an indication of his early date.

Humility, the Woes on the Pharisees, and the Discourse on the Mount of Olives, that its composition was earlier than those of St. Mark and St. Luke.¹

(5) The account of the Resurrection in St. Matthew indicates an early date.

V. The accounts of the Resurrection are another sign of St. Matthew's priority. In his gospel the whole converges plainly on that appearance in Galilee, which our Lord had promised before he suffered,—a promise twice repeated after his resurrection, Matt. xxvi. 32; xxviii. 7, 10. It was evidently the same, which St. Paul mentions, to more than five hundred brethren at once, 1 Cor. xv. 6, and took place on a particular mountain, by express and repeated appointment. Matt. xxviii. 16. Hence St. Matthew's gospel has precisely the features we should expect in the one first written. It singles out the most prominent appearance of our Lord, which had the most numerous witnesses. The motive becomes clearer by a comparison with St. Mark. For he also has recorded the double promise of the appearance in Galilee; but since it was already notorious, and reported by St. Matthew, he replaces it with a brief account of the earliest appearances, in their order of occurrence. The second and third of these are afterwards unfolded by St. Luke, and the first of them by the beloved St. John in the fourth gospel. There is thus a tolerably clear indication of the true order of the gospels, in this one comparison alone.

(6) The account of the Ascension in St. Luke no proof of his priority.

VI. The account of the Ascension in St. Luke's gospel has also been thought a sign of its earlier date. How could St. Matthew, if he wrote first, have neglected to mention a fact of such importance? Its omission by St. Matthew, and by St. Mark in direct narrative, is held to prove that it had been recorded before. Dr. Townson, on the contrary, numbers this omission among the signs that St. Matthew wrote very early. "If he had not written while the Ascension was fresh in memory, and the spectators of it continued together at Jerusalem, he could scarce have failed to notice it."

¹ This argument, sound as far as it goes, must not be pressed too far: for St. John's gospel, confessedly the latest, is rich in doctrinal discourse.—Ed.

The real question seems to be whether an eye-witness in the midst of the scenes, or a later inquirer, would be likely to give the history in the most complete and continuous form. A written gospel, by any of the apostles, would be a selection out of more abundant materials, and the nature of the choice would be partly determined by the position of the writer, and the circle of readers to whom it was first of all addressed. Now the last chapter in Matthew has for its central fact the appearance in Galilee, while the facts in St. Luke, after the Resurrection, are all confined to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. The former character suits a gospel written for the Church in Judea, while the events of our Lord's life in and near Jerusalem were fresh in their minds. The latter character would suit a later gospel, for converts at a distance from Palestine. The view of Dr. Townson seems therefore to be a fair inference from the probable motives that would guide an earlier or a later evangelist in the composition of his narrative. The Ascension is plainly implied, also, in the gospels where it is not fully expressed, so that the detailed account of it in St. Luke's gospel is no proof at all of its earlier composition.

All these general reasons concur in the same result, that the gospel of St. Luke did not precede the two others, which are placed before it in the canon, but really followed them in the order of its publication.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. THE FIRST YEAR OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY.

The double
object of each
successive
writer to sup-
plement and
to confirm the
witness of the
earlier.

THE way is now prepared for the inductive examination, which proves that St. Luke wrote after the date of the two other gospels, and made use of them in the composition of his own. Before instituting this inquiry, in detail, it is needful to guard against a common misapprehension of the view that is maintained in what will follow.

The principle, then, that each later evangelist knew the writings of his predecessors, will by no means imply, as some have hastily assumed, that he would become a mere copyist, even in the parts common to both writers. Each of them was an original authority, possessed of independent information, and might either use it independently, or combine it with the previous accounts, according to the plan and object of his own work. We may assume, as certain, that each later gospel would have a double purpose; to furnish a new testimony of facts already on record, or to communicate new facts and discourses, and place those in a new light which had been previously given. The former object would require that many particulars should be the same; and the latter, that many should be different. The proportion of these might depend on several causes, but the simplest of them would be, the amount of testimony by which the events were confirmed already. Thus, in a second gospel, direct confirmation of the first would be the most prominent object. In a third gospel, while it would still be an important end to confirm the two others, the design of

completing their information by new incidents and discourses would naturally be much more prominent than before. In a fourth gospel, the second object would be likely to supersede the first almost entirely, and its chief character be the record of new particulars, unnoticed by the previous writers.

Such is precisely the relation of the four gospels to each other, as they now stand. The gospel of St. Mark contains very few facts, additional to St. Matthew, and is for the most part like a second witness of the same events. The discourses are abridged or omitted, while the narratives are confirmed with a greater fulness of connection and detail. The gospel of St. Luke fulfils the same purpose with regard to both the others. It includes a large proportion of the facts in St. Matthew, and nearly all those which are peculiar to the second gospel. But then it also contains a large portion of distinct and original matter, amounting to nearly one-half of the whole gospel. The principle is carried still further in the fourth and last gospel of St. John. Except the events of Passion Week, and the feeding of the five thousand, the whole is new and original history. This entire harmony between the natural design of four successive narratives, and the broad features of their mutual relation, as the gospels now stand, is a strong presumption that such was their real purpose, and that they are now placed in their true order of succession.

The nature of the agreement between a later and an earlier gospel, it follows from the same principle, will be most various, and baffle any technical scheme of explanation. In some cases, the second writer might content himself with adopting the statement of the first, either by transcription, or the indirect influence of an account which was already familiar. The relation, here, would resemble that of two copies from the same document. Sometimes he may record the same event more freely in his own language, and there will thus be an imperfect resemblance to two translations from the same original. Sometimes he may combine two previous accounts, with selection and omission, to suit his own style of thought, or point of view ; and here

Explains the complex character of their resemblances.

there will be an appearance of compilation, but perplexed by anomalies, which no artificial or mechanical hypothesis can ever explain. At other times, fresh incidents will be introduced along with the main fact, and thus imply the distinct authority of the new record. Last of all, entirely new incidents will be given; and perhaps, for the sake of brevity, others omitted, and especially those which resemble them most nearly. Hence a series of half resemblances between similar events, differently placed, which will tempt the critic to a process of arbitrary dislocations, and complicate the whole problem of a gospel harmony.

All these characters actually appear in the four gospels. There are passages so much alike, that one seems a verbal copy of the other. There are resemblances verbally defective, but historically complete, which might suggest the theory of a double translation from the same document. There are compound resemblances, where the details of two gospels seem woven into one. There are imperfect correspondences, with omission, insertion, and transposition of incidents. Finally, there are duplicate events, occurring at widely different places in the narrative, but which wear a great resemblance to each other. A common Greek document would explain tolerably a few cases, a Syriac original more imperfectly several others, and there is so much diversity as might seem to justify the idea that the narratives were quite independent. But none of these views will explain the facts, as a whole. The agreements are so numerous and definite in the events, their arrangements, and even the phraseology, as to disprove their independence, and the verbal agreements are too partial and limited, for any common document or documents to account for the remaining diversity. Only the view above will explain the opposite features of resemblance and variety, which actually appear.

The gospels compared in detail to establish their relative priority.

1. The Baptism of John.

Let us now pursue the comparison, more in detail, through successive periods of our Lord's public ministry.¹

I. The Baptism of John, St. Matthew iii. 1-12; St. Mark i.

¹ See note, p. 23.

1-8; St. Luke iii. 1-22, is the first subject for comparison. It stands thus in the three gospels:—

ST. MATTHEW iii. 1-12.

And in those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judæa, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For this is he that was spoken of by Isaiah the prophet, saying,

The voice of one crying in the wilderness,

Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
Make his paths straight.

Now John himself had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey. Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his baptism, he said unto them, Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise

ST. MARK i. 1-8.

The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

Even as it is written in Isaiah the prophet,

Behold, I send thy messenger before thy face,

Who shall prepare thy way;

The voice of one crying in the wilderness,

Make ye ready the way of the Lord,

Make his paths straight;

John came, who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the country of Judæa, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. And John was clothed with camel's hair, and *had* a leathern girdle about his loins, and did eat locusts and wild honey. And he preached, saying, There cometh after me he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.

ST. LUKE iii. 1-22.

Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judæa, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of the region of Ituræa and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene, in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas, the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness. And he came into all the region round about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins; as it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet,

The voice of one crying in the wilderness,

Make ye ready the way of the Lord,
Make his paths straight,

Every valley shall be filled,

And every mountain and hill shall be brought low;

And the crooked shall become straight,

And the rough ways smooth;

And all flesh shall see the salvation of God.

He said therefore to the multitudes that went out to be bap-

up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.

tized of him, Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits worthy of repentance, and begin not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe also laid unto the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. And the multitudes asked him, saying, "What then must we do? And he answered and said unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise. And there came also publicans to be baptized, and they said unto him, Master, what must we do? And he said unto them, Extort no more than that which is appointed you. And soldiers also asked him, saying, And we, what must we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither exact *anything* wrongfully: and be content with your wages.

And as the people were in expectation, and all men reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whe-

ther haply he were the Christ; John answered, saying unto them all, I indeed baptize you with water; but there cometh he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and *with* fire: whose fan is in his hand, throughly to cleanse his threshing-floor, and to gather the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire.

With many other exhortations therefore preached he good tidings unto the people; but Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for Herodias his brother's wife, and for all the evil things which Herod had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John in prison.

St. Mark has here compressed the account into one-half the length of the two other gospels. A simple reason may be assigned, if we suppose him to have written under the direction of St. Peter, or with information derived from him. In this case he would naturally hasten to the point of time where this testimony became available. Accordingly the call of Simon meets us as early as the 16th verse of this gospel, and the events when he was present, and not all the twelve, are given in it with peculiar fulness of description.

The features of St. Luke are those which mark the regular historian, in contrast with an eye-witness of the events. Thus, the date of John's ministry is fixed by

various references, so as to mark the time for general readers. His imprisonment by Herod is mentioned before the writer passes on to the Baptism of our Lord and his public ministry. This is not the instinctive style of an eye-witness, but the reflective manner of a careful historian.

The account of St. Matthew, on the contrary, seems intended for those who were familiar with the name of the Baptist, while the impression of his ministry still survived in great strength. "In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness of Judea." The substance of his message is first given, and then its prophetic warrant, an order more vivid and graphic, but less historical than that of St. Mark. Their resemblance, however, is very close, and implies that one of them knew the work of the other.

When the third gospel is compared with both the others, there are many signs that the writer was familiar with the first, and some indications of a correspondence with the second gospel.

In the earlier verses (St. Luke iii. 1-6) one clause, "preaching the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins," is verbally the same as in St. Mark. In the next there is a gradation. St. Matthew, writing for Jews, makes use of the colloquial form of quotation, "This is he that was spoken of." St. Mark, writing for others also, employs a stricter phrase, "as it is written." St. Luke, for Gentiles less familiar with the prophets, gives a fuller description "in the book of Isaiah the prophet," and also adds a further quotation to show the opening of a wide message of grace to the Gentiles, "And all flesh shall see the salvation of God."

The next passage (St. Luke iii. 7-9) is slightly modified from St. Matthew.

There is here an almost exact coincidence through seven or eight clauses, which clearly proves that one has used the very words of the other, either directly, or in some common source. But the latter view is refuted by other facts, since the parts verbally alike are too few and too

unconnected to have formed a distinct document. Hence, one is a recension of the other. The changes, though slight, imply that St. Luke's is the later gospel. The definite expression, "Many of the Pharisees and Sadducees," is changed to another more intelligible to Gentile converts, "the multitudes that went out to be baptized of him;" and in the only other noticeable variation a more exact expression, "begin not to say," replaces a more colloquial expression, "think not to say within yourselves."

There next follows in St. Luke a supplement (verses 10-14), which proves that the writer had immediate sources of knowledge, and did not merely borrow from others, though he sometimes retains their very words. Then we have a statement of the views of the people (verse 15), which gives new clearness and force to the saying repeated from the former gospels (verse 15), "And as the people were in expectation, and all men reasoned in their hearts concerning John, whether haply he were the Christ, John answered, saying unto them all." The terms of this answer (verses 16, 17) correspond closely with those of St. Mark, and still more closely with those of St. Matthew, whilst the addition in St. Luke only makes this agreement the more striking, "With many other exhortations also preached he good tidings unto the people" (v. 18).

II. Our Lord's Baptism stands thus in the three gospels:—

2. The Baptism of Jesus.

ST. MATTHEW iii. 13-17.

Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer *it* now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffereth him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up

ST. MARK i. 9-11.

And it came to pass, in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon him, and a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased.

ST. LUKE iii. 21-22.

Now it came to pass, when all the people were baptized, that, Jesus also having been baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form, as a dove, upon him, and a voice came out of heaven, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.

straightway from the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon him; and lo, a voice out of the heavens, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

The resemblance of St. Matthew and St. Mark is here very striking. Nazareth is mentioned by the latter, because the previous history of our Lord's residence is not given, and a distinct allusion to it was natural in the first appearance of the Messiah. The other slight changes, besides the omission of the dialogue, render the account less dramatic, and more historical, and thus imply a later composition. The form is still more historical in St. Luke. The indirect construction removes it further from the tone and colouring of an eye-witness. The prayer of Jesus is a fresh incident, and a mark of independent information. The rest is verbally the same, either with St. Matthew or St. Mark, except the one change from direct to indirect narrative.¹ There is thus a plain presumption that the writer simply recast the previous accounts of the baptism to suit the style of his own history.

3. The Temptation.

III. The History of the Temptation is given in brief by St. Mark, and more fully by St. Matthew and St. Luke. The chief difference is in the arrangement of the second and third temptations. If we were to judge from the connectives alone, St. Matthew would seem to give the true order.² But there are several reasons for an opposite view. The three kinds of temptation are the same which appear in the history of the Fall, Gen. iii. 6, and in the

¹ And the phrase, *σωματικῶς ἑίδει*, which has the air of added explanation.—ED.

² In a little work, "God's Champion, Man's Example" (R. T. S.), I have given my reasons for strongly inclining to this view of the chronological sequence. The point is not one on which certainty is attainable, and does not at all affect the general argument.—ED.

statement of St. John (1 John ii. 16), and in both of these the order is the same as in St. Luke, and the pride of life occupies the third place. This is also clearly the most subtle and dangerous temptation, and therefore is likely to have been the last. The prominence, also, given in St. Matthew to the kingly office of our Lord, would explain a departure from the actual order. The connective, *τότε*, is often used by him for a sequence not immediate, and the word *πάλιν* may refer to the narrative, rather than the action, and signify merely a further incident to be recorded, without fixing its succession. It seems then, on the whole, at least not improbable that the third gospel has restored the true order. The accounts, in other respects, are as follows :—

ST. MATTHEW iv. 1-11.

Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he afterwards hungered. And the tempter came and said unto him, If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread. But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Then the devil taketh him into the holy city; and he set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou art the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written,

He shall give his angels charge concerning thee:

ST. MARK i. 12, 13.

And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan, and he was with the wild beasts, and the angels ministered unto him.

ST. LUKE iv. 1-13.

And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan, and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days, being tempted of the devil. And he did eat nothing in those days: and when they were completed, he hungered. And the devil said unto him, If thou art the Son of God, command this stone that it become bread. And Jesus answered unto him, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone. And he led him up, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, To thee will I give all this authority, and the glory of them: for it hath been delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I

And on their hands
they shall bear
thee up,
Lest haply thou
dash thy foot
against a stone.

Jesus said unto him,
Again it is written,
Thou shalt not tempt
the Lord thy God.
Again, the devil tak-
eth him unto an ex-
ceeding high moun-
tain, and sheweth
him all the kingdoms
of the world, and the
glory of them; and
he said unto him, All
these things will I
give thee, if thou wilt
fall down and worship
me. Then saith Jesus
unto him, Get thee
hence, Satan: for it
is written, Thou shalt
worship the Lord thy
God, and him only
shalt thou serve. Then
the devil leaveth him;
and behold, angels
came and ministered
unto him.

will I give it. If thou
therefore wilt worship
before me, it shall all
be thine. And Jesus
answered and said
unto him, It is writ-
ten, Thou shalt wor-
ship the Lord thy
God, and him only
shalt thou serve. And
he led him to Jerusa-
lem, and set him on
the pinnacle of the
temple, and said unto
him, If thou art the
Son of God, cast thy-
self down from hence:
for it is written,

He shall give his
angels charge
concerning thee,
to guard thee:

and,

On their hands they
shall bear thee
up,

Lest haply thou
dash thy foot
against a stone.

And Jesus answering
said unto him, It is
said, Thou shalt not
tempt the Lord thy
God.

And when the devil
had completed every
temptation, he de-
parted from him for
a season.

Here the brief expression, "when he had fasted forty days," &c., is replaced by a paraphrase in St. Luke. The present tense is exchanged throughout for the past, which suits a more distant narrator. The phrase, Matt. iv. 4, which might be perverted by Gentile readers, and lower their conception of the true God to a resemblance of false divinities, is altered to a simpler expression. Instead of *κόσμος*, we find the more classical term, *οἰκουμένη*, and the temptation is exhibited more fully, so that its apparent grossness is removed, and the tempter is seen to have asked only for a subordinate homage, as a permitted vice-

gerent of the Almighty. Lastly, instead of "the holy city," a title natural in the lips of a Jew, writing for Jews at an earlier date, we have the simple name, Jerusalem. The closing sentence, in St. Luke, is also less dramatic, and has the tone of connected history, since it plainly refers to the time of the agony and the crucifixion. With these exceptions the agreement is so full and close, as almost to require the admission that one writer knew the account of the other. The variations cannot be explained, either by a common Greek or Hebrew document, but are accounted for simply by the point of view in each writer. St. Matthew is more dramatic and idiomatic; while the third gospel is more classical in style, and more historical in its tone. The brief account in St. Mark, by its last clause, shows its closer relation to the account in St. Matthew.

IV. The opening of the ministry in Galilee is thus stated in the three gospels:—

4. The opening
of the Minis-
try.

ST. MATTHEW iv. 12-17.

Now when he heard that John was delivered up, he withdrew into Galilee; and leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is by the sea, in the borders of Zebulun and Naphtali: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying,

The land of Zebulun
and the land of
Naphtali,
Towards the sea,
beyond Jordan,
Galilee of the Gen-
tiles,
The people which
sat in darkness,
Saw a great light,
And to them which
sat in the region

ST. MARK i. 14-19.

Now after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God and saying,

The time is fulfilled,

The kingdom of God
is at hand,

Repent ye, and believe in the gospel.

ST. LUKE iv. 13-16 and 31.

And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: and a fame went out concerning him through all the region round about. And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all.

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up:

31. And he came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee.

and shadow of
 death,
 To them did light
 spring up.
 From that time be-
 gan Jesus to preach,
 and to say, Repent
 ye; for the kingdom
 of heaven is at hand.

Here, in the two former gospels, the brief allusion to St. John's imprisonment, which has not been mentioned, implies that they wrote for a class of readers to whom it was familiarly known. St. Luke, on the contrary, has briefly mentioned it before, in its natural place, at the close of John's public ministry. We have here, then, a sign of the early date of the two first gospels, or of their adaptation to readers in Palestine.

The next difference in St. Mark, the omission of Nazareth, is very soon explained. He had not mentioned the long residence of Jesus in that city, and it was therefore needless to specify his removal from it. But his use of the word *gospel*, absolutely, for the doctrine of Christ, of which there is no example in St. Matthew, is a clear sign that he wrote at a later period.

The quotation from Isaiah, in the first gospel, is another striking feature. Thirteen instances are found in St. Matthew, where the writer himself points out the fulfilment of prophecy, two only in St. Mark, and one solitary instance in St. Luke. This is a proof that St. Matthew wrote more directly for Jewish readers, and a presumption that his gospel was early, while Jewish converts were the main body of the Church of Christ.

St. Luke, again, evidently supplies an hiatus in the first gospel. We were there told that Jesus left Nazareth, but no reason for the removal, and no account of its circumstances, was given. The third gospel, in chapter iv. 16-30, sets these before us, and shows us why he forsook the home of his early years, and chose another centre for his public ministry. The supplementary character is here very apparent.

The two descriptions of Capernaum are equally instruc-

tive, as to the special purpose of each gospel. The phrase "Capernaum, which is by the sea," could be appropriate only in one whose home was near the lake of Tiberias, when writing for the dwellers in Palestine. On the contrary, "Capernaum, a city of Galilee," is just as clear a token that the writer was addressing a circle of readers out of Palestine, and little acquainted with the minuter features of its geography.

V. The Call of the Four Disciples, St. Matt. iv. 13-22, St. Mark i. 16-20, and Miraculous Draught, Luke v. 1-11, is the next subject of comparison, and has occasioned a great division of judgment. Most recent critics, as Neander, Olshausen, Wieseler and Robinson, affirm the event to be the same, but others, as Mr. Greswell, believe them successive and distinct. The decision of this point has an important bearing on the mutual relation of the three gospels, and especially on that of St. Luke to the two others.

5. The Call
of the Four
Apostles.

ST. MATTHEW iv. 13-22.

And walking by the sea of Galilee, he saw two brethren, Simon who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he saith unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left the nets, and followed him. And going on from thence he saw other two brethren, James, the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the boat with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they straightway left the boat and their father, and followed him.

ST. MARK i. 16-20.

And passing along by the sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon casting a net in the sea: for they were fishers. And Jesus said unto them, Come ye after me, and I will make you to become fishers of men. And straightway they left the nets, and followed him. And going on a little further, he saw James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, who also were in the boat mending the nets. And straightway he called them: and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired servants, and went after him.

ST. LUKE v. 1-11.

Now it came to pass, while the multitude pressed upon him and heard the word of God, that he was standing by the lake of Gennesaret; and he saw two boats standing by the lake: but the fishermen had gone out of them, and were washing their nets. And he entered into one of the boats, which was Simon's, and asked him to put out a little from the land. And he sat down and taught the multitudes out of the boat. And when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. And Simon answered and said, Master, we toiled all

night, and took nothing: but at thy word I will let down the nets. And when they had this done, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes; and their nets were breaking; and they beckned unto their partners in the other boat, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink. But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was amazed, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken; and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men. And when they had brought their boats to land, they left all, and followed him.

Not the same
event as the
Miraculous
Draught.

The features of contrast are thus stated by Mr. Greswell. In one case, Jesus was walking by the shore; in the other, he was standing by the lake, and purposing to teach the people. In one, he never quitted the land; in the other, he put out to sea. In one, the ships were seen on the sea, in the other, drawn up on the shore; in one, apart, in the other, close together. In one case, Simon and Andrew were first seen in one ship, and then James and John in theirs; in the other, both ships were empty, and the fishers had left them. In one, Andrew and Simon were letting down their net, and James and John preparing to do the

same; in the other, all were washing their nets together. In one, Simon and Andrew were first called by themselves, then, after an interval, the others; in the second account, all were seen and called together. In one, the call was from the land, in the other, from the midst of the sea, and the words used were quite distinct. In one, they forsook only their nets and ship, in the other, they abandoned the large capture of fishes also. In one case, they were invited to follow Jesus, in the other, they did so, under the impression of the miracle, of their own accord.

To remove these contradictions, several suppositions have been made; that Jesus was first walking by the lake, and then, in consequence of the throng, entered the ship of Simon; that the miraculous draught followed, and afterwards the call took place, while Simon and Andrew were washing their nets after the draught, and James and John were repairing that which was broken. But besides the wide departure from the natural meaning of St. Matthew's words, the difficulties that remain appear insuperable. It is clear from St. Luke that the words of Jesus to Simon were spoken in the ship, while the impression of the miracle was deepest, and the four disciples were present together. In the other account, Jesus walks some distance along the shore, after the call of Simon and Andrew, before he speaks to the sons of Zebedee. We have thus to assume that he left the ship, after the miracle, and Simon and Andrew stayed in it, washing one of their nets; that James and John withdrew from their partners to some distance, taking Simon's net which was broken, and set about repairing it; and that last of all, our Lord returned after a short absence, and called first Simon and Andrew, and then James and John, from their unseasonable employment. The significance and beauty of each narrative is thus completely destroyed. The deep impression of the miracle would have disappeared, as soon as it was wrought; while the power of a simple call from Jesus, and the prompt obedience of the disciples, is converted into a tardy compliance with his injunctions, after an unnatural and unseemly delay. For St. Mark has told us that hired

servants were present in one of the ships, so that there could be no need, on the lowest view, for Simon and Andrew to wash one net, and for James and John to repair the other. We have the further incongruity, that the net and ship were Simon's, and one only employed; while the sons of Zebedee must be supposed to have carried it away with them, in order to repair it. The solution, then, is quite incredible and untrue.

The difficulties, on the other hypothesis, may be easily removed. The first is drawn from the fact, that each gospel records only one such call of the Four Apostles by the lake of Galilee. But there are many instances, in the gospels, of two similar events, where the same evangelist records one only. This Miraculous Draught is itself a case in point, since another is reported in the fourth gospel, which greatly resembled it, and still is quite distinct in time, being after the Resurrection, and in many other circumstances. St. John, also, records another call of these same apostles, earlier than the one by the sea of Galilee.

The nearness of the two events in time, if not the same, has been further held a proof of their identity. The transposition, in St. Luke, would be only through twelve verses. The real question, however, is of the historical interval, and not of the number of verses in which intervening events are described. According to all the three gospels, a circuit of Galilee came between them, besides the first public opening of the ministry at Capernaum. Hence, on the shortest view of its length, the distance between them would be two or three months. But since only the cure of the Leper and the Paralytic, the call of Levi, and the feast in his house, are recorded by St. Mark and St. Luke before the second Passover, it is clearly quite possible, from these dates alone, that the interval might be six or seven months, and was quite enough to render the second call natural and consistent.

It is further objected that the apostles, after the first call, would never return so soon to their usual occupation. But the statement in the fourth gospel removes this objection also. That call, we there see, was not the first begin-

ning of their discipleship, and after attending Jesus some time, they had returned to their usual occupation. Even after the Resurrection, they are found once again, while waiting for the appearance of their Lord, still employing themselves as fishermen. Having, then, accompanied our Lord throughout his first circuit of Galilee, they might naturally feel at liberty to do the same, on his return to Capernaum, their own home, until he summoned them for another journey. And since their first call was without a miracle, they might understand very imperfectly the purpose of the invitation. After the Miraculous Draught they would begin to see its full import, and attach themselves permanently to their Lord through the rest of his ministry.

There are other indications, in the two accounts, that they refer to distinct events. It has been shown how carefully St. Mark has restored the true order, when St. Matthew had departed from it, and hence we may infer that the call, in those gospels, is in its true place. But the Miraculous Draught was occasioned by the thousands who pressed on our Lord. This might naturally occur at the close of a first circuit of Galilee, but is hardly probable, before his public teaching at Capernaum had begun. The cure of Simon's wife's mother has been mentioned by St. Luke before, and hence he cannot intend the narrative to be that of his first introduction to Jesus, which, as we know also from St. John, was much earlier. Indeed the name *ἐπιστάτα*, Master, is a clear sign that he was already a disciple. St. Luke adheres so regularly, in this part, to the order of St. Mark, that there is no reason why he should here forsake it, if he purposed to describe the same event. It might just as easily have been given in the right order, at iv. 31. The call, again, seems to have been in an evening when the fishing was just begun, while the other event was plainly in the morning, after the night's toil was over. The words "casting a net into the sea, for they were fishers," cannot without violence be expounded "washing their nets, because they were abandoning their occupation for ever." The words of our Lord, after the miracle, seem also to

imply that it was later in time than the call in St. Matthew. "Follow me, and I will make you to become fishers of men," was simply a promise to fit and prepare them for a higher office. But the words "Fear not, from this time thou shalt be capturing men," *ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν*—is a further promise, of success in a work for which he had already prepared them. The contrast is just the same as between the act of casting a net, uncertain of the result, and the spectacle of a large draught of fishes, actually secured.

The distinctness of the two events being established, important inferences will follow. St. Matthew and St. Mark, who relate the original call, would seem to have been earlier than St. Luke, who passes it by, to record a later event of a similar nature; just as the fourth gospel, which was plainly later still, passes by the Miraculous Draught here mentioned, and recounts another, which took place after the Resurrection. Next, we have here a sign that the writer of the third gospel had access to direct and original sources of information. No common document can here help in the least to explain the relation of the three gospels. Further, we have a proof that the evangelist used a principle of wise selection, and purposely avoided introducing too many events, closely resembling each other, even when aware of their actual occurrence. These maxims are fully confirmed by other examples, that will appear later in the narrative.

6. The Dis-
possession in
Capernaum.

VI. The Dispossession in Capernaum is not given by St. Matthew, but is found in both St. Mark and St. Luke (Mark i. 21-28; Luke iv. 31-37).

ST. MARK i. 21-28.

And they go into Capernaum; and straightway on the sabbath day he entered into the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his teaching: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes. And straightway there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of

ST. LUKE iv. 31-37.

And he came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee. And he was teaching them on the sabbath day: and they were astonished at his teaching; for his word was with authority. And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil; and he cried out with a loud voice, Ah! what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked

God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And the unclean spirit, tearing him and crying with a loud voice, came out of him. And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching! with authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him. And the report of him went out straightway everywhere into all the region of Galilee round about.

him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him down in the midst, he came out of him, having done him no hurt. And amazement came upon all, and they spake together, one with another, saying, What is this word? for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out. And there went forth a rumour concerning him into every place of the region round about.

Here the resemblance is so close as almost to prove that one writer has adopted the narrative of the other, with a few alterations of style. And there are several indications that St. Luke has revised St. Mark's narrative, and not the reverse. Its introduction, in the second gospel, is simply explained by the reasons already given. When the cure of Simon's mother-in-law was restored to its true place, it was natural to supply the intermediate link, which connected it with the call of the disciples. Again, the third gospel, if one purpose of it were to confirm the authority of both its predecessors, would naturally repeat most of the few incidents which were peculiar to the second. But the slight variations equally imply the order of two narratives. Capernaum is described by St. Luke as a city of Galilee, which shows that he wrote for readers beyond the limits of Palestine. The verse, Mark i. 22, is verbally the same as Matt. viii. 28, 29, and when the Sermon was omitted, is transferred to its fittest place, at the first public exercise of our Lord's ministry. In St. Luke the allusion to the Scribes is omitted, as less adapted to the Gentile readers. The fuller phrase, "a spirit of an unclean demon," seems designed to meet the classic usage, in which *demon* is used ambiguously, either for a good or an evil power. The other variations are also explained by the tendency in the writer of the third gospel to a style more purely Greek and classical than that of the two other evangelists.

VII. The account of the cures, Matt. viii. 14-17; Mark i. 29-39; Luke iv. 38-44, yields another proof of the

7. Account of Cures on and after Sabbath.

connection of the three gospels, and of their relative order.

ST. MATTHEW viii.
14-17.

And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother lying sick of a fever. And he touched her hand, and the fever left her; and she arose, and ministered unto him. And when even was come, they brought unto him many possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases.

ST. MARK i. 29-39.

And straightway, when they were come out of the synagogue, they came into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John. Now Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever; and straightway they tell him of her: and he came and took her by the hand, and raised her up; and the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.

And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were sick, and them that were possessed with devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many that were sick with divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and he suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him.

And in the morning, a great while before day, he rose up and went out, and departed into a desert place, and there prayed. And Simon and they that were with him followed after him; and they found him, and say unto him, All are seeking thee. And he saith unto them, Let us go elsewhere into the next town, that I

ST. LUKE iv. 38-44.

And he rose up from the synagogue, and entered into the house of Simon. And Simon's wife's mother was holden with a great fever; and they besought him for her. And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she rose up and ministered unto them.

And when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them. And devils also came out from many, crying out, and saying, Thou art the Son of God. And rebuking them, he suffered them not to speak, because they knew that he was the Christ.

And when it was day, he came out and went into a desert place: and the multitudes sought after him, and came unto him, and would have stayed him, that he should not go from them. But he said unto them, I must preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also: for therefore was I sent.

may preach there also;
for to this end came I
forth. And he went
into their synagogues
throughout all Galilee,
preaching and casting
out devils.

The record in St. Matthew is very brief. In St. Mark nearly every phrase is retained, but many other particulars are given. The whole description is also that of an eyewitness, and the succession of events is clearly determined, the cure in the house, the cures after sunset, when the Sabbath was over, and the departure from prayer early in the morning, followed by a circuit of Galilee. The verbal resemblance is close—

ST. MATTHEW.

ἔλθων εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρον.
εἶδε τὴν πενθέραν αὐτοῦ . . πυρέσ-
σουσαν.
ἤψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς.
ἠγέρθη καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ (αὐτοῖς).
ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης, δαιμονιζομέ-
νους ἐξέβαλε.
πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας.
ἐθεράπευσεν.

ST. MARK.

ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος.
ἡ δὲ πενθερά Σίμωνος κατέκειτο
πυρέσσουσα.
κράτησας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς.
ἠγείρεν αὐτήν . . . καὶ διηκόνει
αὐτοῖς.
ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης.
πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας.
ἐθεράπευσε . . ἐξέβαλε.

But St. Mark alone mentions that the house was that of Andrew, as well as Simon, that James and John were present, that the disciples requested Jesus to effect the cure, and that after sunset, the whole city were gathered at the door; while the subsequent retirement for prayer, and its immediate result in the first circuit, are entirely additional. St. Matthew had not stated that the sick were brought to Jesus, as well as the possessed, but simply implies it by his mention of both alike as cured. St. Mark has supplied this omission, and tells us that both were brought, and both were healed.

St. Luke, again, retains the additional facts of St. Mark, except those which are most dramatic, and least essential to the history,—the presence of James and John, and the crowding of the whole city to the door. But the phraseology is greatly modified, and most of the terms which are common to the former gospels are here replaced by others. For

ἦλθον, or ἔλθων, we have εἰσῆλθεν; for πυρέσσουσα, κατεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ; ¹ for ὀψίας γενομένης, δύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου; for πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας, πάντες ὅσοι ἔιχον ἀσθενούντας νόσοις ποικίλαις; for ἐξέβαλε πνύματα, ἐξήρχετο δαιμόνια. The transition, in some clauses, is evident. Thus St. Matthew fixes the time of the cures, "when the even was come," ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης. St. Mark retains the phrase, and adds another to explain it more fully, when the sun did set, ὅτε ἔδυν ὁ ἥλιος. St. Luke retains only the second, and puts it in a more classical form, δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου.

In the added particulars, while St. Luke adheres closely to the substance and order of St. Mark's statements, the language is freely changed, and rendered more classical. The brief expression, "because they knew him," is simply expounded, "because they knew him to be the Christ." The provincial phrase, πρῶτ' ἔννυχον λῖαν, is also replaced by another of pure Greek usage, "γενομένης ἡμέρας," or "when the day broke." This difference is very observable in Mark i. 38, and Luke iv. 43, 44, where a somewhat harsh and idiomatic is changed into an elegant and classical phraseology.

8. The Cure of the Leper.

VIII. The Cure of the Leper, Matt. viii. 1-4. Mark i. 40-44, Luke v. 12-14, exhibits signs of the connection and order of the three narratives.

ST. MATTHEW viii. 1-4.

And when he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him. And behold, there came to him a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean. And straightway his leprosy was cleansed.

ST. MARK i. 40-44.

And there cometh to him a leper, beseeching him, and kneeling down to him, and saying unto him, If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And being moved with compassion, he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou made clean. And straightway the leprosy departed from him, and he was made

ST. LUKE v. 12-14.

And it came to pass, while he was in one of the cities, behold, a man full of leprosy: and when he saw Jesus, he fell on his face, and besought him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And he stretched forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean. And straightway the leprosy departed from

¹ A more distinctly medical phrase.—ED.

And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

clean. And he strictly charged him, and straightway sent him out, and saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to spread abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into a city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

him. And he charged him to tell no man: but go thy way, and shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing, according as Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. But so much the more went abroad the report concerning him: and great multitudes came together to hear, and to be healed of their infirmities. But he withdrew himself in the deserts, and prayed.

That of St. Matthew is brief and simple in the extreme. St. Mark has added graphic details, and noticed the historical result. The worship, Matt. viii. 2, is expounded by its visible features, "entreating him, and falling on his knees before him." The charge is described more fully. "He strictly charged him, and forthwith sent him away." The speediness of the cure is further noted by the clause "as soon as he had spoken," and the motives of Jesus by a single word, "moved with compassion." The briefer phrase in St. Matthew, "his leprosy was cleansed," is given more fully. "His leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed;" while the gift receives a similar paraphrase. "Offer for thy cleansing what Moses appointed." The language, in most other respects, is verbally the same.

St. Luke has retained the chief additions of St. Mark, but abridged his narrative, and adopted a more historical and classical style. He begins with the general description of the place, where the cure was wrought. "It came to pass, when he was in a certain city." The description of the leper becomes "a man full of leprosy."¹ The worship of St.

¹ Again a more medical phrase.—Ed.

Matthew, and the peculiar term of St. Mark, γονυπετῶν, are replaced by the classic idiom, "he fell upon his face." The words of the request, and the reply, are the same in all the writers; but the account of the parting charge is more gracefully blended with the words themselves, by passing from the indirect to the direct construction. The explanatory words, "for thy cleansing," are retained. The final statement, while the same in substance as that of St. Mark, has clearly been moulded from a more dramatic, into a more historical form.

9. The Healing
of the Para-
lytic.

IX. The Healing of the Paralytic is a still more striking proof of the relation which connects these three gospels. The short account of St. Matthew is plainly the basis of the two others, and St. Luke has modified slightly the fuller narrative of the second gospel.

ST. MATTHEW ix. 1-9.

And he entered into a boat, and crossed over, and came into his own city. And behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven. And behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This man blasphemeth. And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? For whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, and take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose,

ST. MARK ii. 1-12.

And when he entered again into Capernaum after some days, it was noised that he was in the house. And many were gathered together, so that there was no longer room for them, no, not even about the door: and he spake the word unto them. And they come, bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy, borne of four. And when they could not come nigh unto him for the crowd, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed whereon the sick of the palsy lay. And Jesus seeing their faith saith unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins are forgiven. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, Why

ST. LUKE v. 17-26.

And it came to pass on one of those days, that he was teaching; and there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, which were come out of every village of Galilee and Judæa and Jerusalem: and the power of the Lord was with him to heal. And behold, men bring on a bed a man that was palsied: and they sought to bring him in, and to lay him before him. And not finding by what way they might bring him in because of the multitude, they went up to the housetop, and let him down through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus. And seeing their faith, he said, Man, thy sins are forgiven thee. And the scribes and the Pharisees began to reason, saying, Who

and departed to his house. But when the multitudes saw it, they were afraid, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.

doth this man thus speak? he blasphemeth: who can forgive sins but one, *even* God? And straightway Jesus, perceiving in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, saith unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.

is this that speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone? But Jesus perceiving their reasonings, answered and said unto them, What reason ye in your hearts? Whether is easier, to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he said unto him that was palsied), I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy couch, and go unto thy house. And immediately he rose up before them, and took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his house, glorifying God. And amazement took hold on all, and they glorified God; and they were filled with fear, saying, We have seen strange things to-day.

The shorter account of St. Matthew is much amplified in the two other gospels. On the other hand, these agree in all the main particulars, but St. Luke omits the minuter details of St. Mark, and gives the whole a more complete and historical form. The opening verses are a picture in the one, such as an eye-witness might supply; in the other, a comprehensive statement of the circumstances, most important for the general reader to understand, that he might see the scope of the narrative. The words of our Lord are almost verbally the same in all the three writers. The last verses in St. Luke are variations of those in St. Mark, and differ from them chiefly by a more classical tone. Every feature is satisfied by the hypothesis, that St. Mark has amplified St. Matthew, and St. Luke has adopted in the

main St. Mark's fuller account, but moulded it into a style and form adapted for Greek readers and for general history.

10. The Call
of St. Mat-
thew.

X. The call of Levi or Matthew is placed, in each gospel, after the cure of the Paralytic, and throws light on their connection.

ST. MATTHEW ix. 9.

And as Jesus passed by from thence, he saw a man, called Matthew, sitting at the place of toll: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him.

ST. MARK ii. 13, 14.

And he went forth again by the sea side; and all the multitude resorted unto him, and he taught them. And as he passed by, he saw Levi the son of Alphæus sitting at the place of toll, and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him.

ST. LUKE v. 27-29.

And after these things he went forth, and beheld a publican, named Levi, sitting at the place of toll, and said unto him, Follow me. And he forsook all, and rose up and followed him. And Levi made him a great feast in his house: and there was a great multitude of publicans and of others that were sitting at meat with them.

The phrase in Matthew, "passing by," *παράγων*, is retained by Mark, who gives a fuller description of the circumstances of the call. St. Luke omits the phrase of St. Matthew, and several details of St. Mark, but adopts from him the sequence "after these things," the expression "he went forth," the name, "Levi," instead of Matthew, and the order of its introduction, before and not after the place where the call occurred. No other arrangement of the narrative will account so well for their slight variations. Again, the place of entertainment is clearer in St. Mark than in St. Matthew, and in St. Luke than in either. That it was a special feast, given by the publican in gratitude to our Lord after his call, appears in this gospel only. There is thus a plain mark of their relative succession, and that the later Evangelist has rendered the statement of the earlier more perspicuous for general readers.

The change of the name, which has led some to a most unreasonable theory, that two different persons were meant, admits of a satisfactory solution. St. Matthew tacitly marks his own authorship, by the modest addition he

makes in the list of the apostles—Matthew the publican. The two others drop this humbling epithet, and place his name before that of Thomas in their lists. This account of his call, in the first gospel, fixes the reader's attention strongly on the nature of the apostle's former occupation. The other evangelists, by mentioning him here under another name, leave him to be the sole informant of the church respecting a fact odious and humiliating to Jewish ears. This moral delicacy, on their part, is the exact counterpart of the humility which the apostle displays in his own statements; and it implies that their narratives were designed in their use by the church at large, to be supplementary to the first gospel.

The words of St. Mark seem to imply that Levi was the usual name of the apostle at the time of his call. Its displacement afterwards, by another, has an exact parallel in "Lebbeus, surnamed Thaddeus," whom St. Luke calls Judas, and St. John, "Judas, not Iscariot," where no trace of his former name appears. It seems that St. Mark, or his authority, knew Levi familiarly under that name before his call, and Peter would certainly know the name of the tax-gatherer at the place of custom near Capernaum.

Explains the complex character of their resemblances.

XI. The Discourse in the Publican's house is a striking instance of the verbal correspondence between all the three gospels, and a disproof of their absolute independence.

11. The Discourse at the Feast.

ST. MATTHEW ix. 11-17.

And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with the publicans and sinners? But when he heard it, he said, They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what *this* meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice: for I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.

ST. MARK ii. 16-22.

And the scribes and the Pharisees when they saw that he was eating with the sinners and publicans, said unto his disciples, He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners.

And when Jesus heard it, he saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.

ST. LUKE v. 30-39.

And the Pharisees and their scribes murmured against his disciples, saying, Why do ye eat and drink with the publicans and sinners? And Jesus answering said unto them, They that are whole have no need of a physician; but they that are sick. I am not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. And they said unto him, The disciples of

Then come to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the sons of the bride-chamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast. And no man putteth a piece of undressed cloth upon an old garment; for that which should fill it up taketh from the garment, and a worse rent is made. Neither do *men* put new wine into old wine-skins: else the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins perish: but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins, and both are preserved.

And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting: and they come and say unto him, Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? as long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day. No man seweth a piece of undressed cloth on an old garment: else that which should fill it up taketh from it, the new from the old, and a worse rent is made. And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins: but *they put* new wine into fresh wine-skins.

John fast often, and make supplications; likewise also the *disciples* of the Pharisees; but thine eat and drink. And Jesus said unto them, Can ye make the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come; and when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, then will they fast in those days. And he spake also a parable unto them; No man rendeth a piece from a new garment and putteth it upon an old garment; else he will rend the new, and also the piece from the new will not agree with the old. And no man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the new wine will burst the skins, and itself will be spilled, and the skins will perish. But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins. And no man having drunk old *wine* desireth new: for he saith, The old is good.

Amidst the close resemblance, amounting almost to identity, in the three narratives, the variations illustrate their mutual relation, and their successive order of composition.

The murmuring, in St. Matthew, is against our Lord himself, "Why eateth your Master, &c.?" In St. Mark, less explicitly, "How is it that he eateth and drinketh, &c.?" In St. Luke, against the disciples, "Why do ye eat and drink, &c.?" It is probable that the last was the actual form of expression, but this implied a direct charge against our Lord himself, and St. Matthew records the

inquiry in its spirit, rather than its precise words. In St. Mark this difference is made less prominent, and in St. Luke the direct words of the inquiry are restored. Our Lord then replies to the charge insinuated, rather than expressed, and justifies his own conduct as the Physician of souls. The quotation in St. Matthew is omitted in the two other gospels, as this appeal to the prophets is the distinctive feature of a narrative, designed more expressly for Jewish readers. The rest of the answer is verbally the same, in all the three writers. The opening of the next passage exhibits a slight variation. If we suppose that some one or more of John's disciples put the question to Jesus, in the words given by St. Mark, the difference may be simply explained. St. Matthew modifies the phrase from his own knowledge of the parties, "Why do *we*," &c. St. Mark gives the words more accurately, and prefixes a short explanation of the circumstances. St. Luke gives the inquiry from St. Mark, slightly paraphrased, so as to dispense with his formal explanation. The word, *mourn*, which St. Matthew has introduced, as expressing the scope and spirit of our Lord's remark, is replaced in the other gospels by the exact phrase, which it is probable that our Lord would employ. The parable exhibits a close verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark, and in their slight variations St. Luke adheres sometimes to one, and sometimes to the other; while in the precise form of the illustration he varies from both, and adds a further parable in the closing verse, which, even where he copies so closely the phraseology of his predecessors, reminds us of his distinct and independent authority.

There are thus, in every part of these chapters, clear signs that the evangelists were not independent of each other, but that St. Mark freely made use of St. Matthew, and St. Luke of both the previous gospels; while the evidence is equally full and strong, that the later did not merely copy from the earlier, but moulded their narrative with reference to a definite purpose of their own, enriching it with fresh details, and a great variety of original information.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN BY
THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. FROM THE SECOND PASSOVER TO
THE TRANSFIGURATION.

THE second main division of the history, with reference to the structure of the gospels, is that which commences at the passage through the Corn-fields, and ends with the Transfiguration, or more exactly, with the discourse which followed not long after at Capernaum. The third gospel, after this point, diverges from the two others through nine chapters, and proceeds alone. The comparison of the three narratives, in this second portion, leads to the same results as before; but its extent will render it needful to select some particulars only.

I. Comparison
of Matt. xii.
1-21, Mark
ii. 23-iii. 19,
Luke vi. 1-18.

I. The passages to be first compared are Matthew xii. 1-21, Mark ii. 23-iii. 19, Luke vi. 1-19, which include (a) the discourse on the Sabbath, (β) the cure of the withered hand, and (γ) the healing of the multitudes and ordination of the apostles.

(a) The Sab-
bath and
Corn-fields.

(a) *The Discourse on the Sabbath, and the Corn-fields.*

ST. MATTHEW xii. 1-8.

At that season Jesus went on the sabbath day through the corn-fields; and his disciples were an hungred, and began to pluck ears of corn, and to eat. But the Pharisees, when they saw

ST. MARK ii. 23-28.

And it came to pass, that he was going on the sabbath day through the corn-fields, and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said unto

ST. LUKE vi. 1-5.

Now it came to pass on a¹ sabbath, that he was going through the corn-fields; and his disciples plucked the ears of corn, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands. But certain of the Pharisees

¹ Many ancient authorities insert "second-first."—R.V. margin. My father fully believed that these were right.—ED.

it, said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which it is not lawful to do upon the sabbath. But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shew-bread, which it was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them that were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless? But I say unto you, that one greater than the temple is here. But if ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is lord of the sabbath.

him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful? And he said unto them, Did ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him? How he entered into the house of God when Abiathar was high priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him? And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: so that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath.

said, Why do ye that which it is not lawful to do on the sabbath day? And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read even this, what David did, when he was an hungred, he, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did take and eat the shew-bread, and gave also to them that were with him; which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests alone? And he said unto them, The Son of man is lord of the sabbath.

The opening words, in St. Matthew, are general. "At that season Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the corn-fields." It seems to imply a time not very distant from the Baptist's message, in chap. xi. St. Mark does not report that message, and states the time more generally. St. Luke places the message of John not much later, and adds here a peculiar note of time, "It came to pass on a second-first sabbath." The meaning is probably, the first of the seven numbered Sabbaths, after the morrow of the Sabbath in the Passover feast. St. Luke has thus added another of those notes of time, which prove the orderly nature of his gospel, and places the event at the opening of the second year in our Lord's ministry. St.

Mark has restored the order of time, which was neglected by St. Matthew, and St. Luke has added a fuller indication of the real date.

The allusion to the Temple, and the quotation from Hosea, are both peculiar to St. Matthew, and are another sign that his gospel was intended specially for the Jews. The answer, abridged by St. Mark, is still further abridged in the third gospel.

(3) The With-
ered Hand.

(3) *The Cure of the Withered Hand.*

ST. MATTHEW xii. 9-14.

And he departed thence, and went into their synagogue: and behold, a man having a withered hand. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man of more value than a sheep! Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the sabbath day. Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, as the other. But the Pharisees went out, and took counsel against him, how they might destroy him.

ST. MARK iii. 1-6.

And he entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had his hand withered. And they watched him, whether he would heal him on the sabbath day; that they might accuse him. And he saith unto the man that had his hand withered, Stand forth. And he saith unto them, Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill? But they held their peace. And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth: and his hand was restored. And the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him.

ST. LUKE vi. 6-11.

And it came to pass on another sabbath, that he entered into the synagogue and taught: and there was a man there, and his right hand was withered. And the scribes and the Pharisees watched him, whether he would heal on the sabbath; that they might find how to accuse him. But he knew their thoughts; and he said to the man that had his hand withered, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth. And Jesus said unto them, I ask you, Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to destroy it? And he looked round about on them all, and said unto him, Stretch forth thy hand. And he did so: and his hand was restored. But they were filled with madness; and communed one with another what they might do to Jesus.

St. Luke's account has several traces of its later composition. He states from the first, what the others leave to be inferred from the narrative, that it took place on a Sabbath; and instead of the phrase in St. Mark, "that they might accuse him," gives another, more explicit and classical, "that they might find an accusation against him." The last sentence, vi. 11, differs from both the other gospels, by omitting all allusion to the Jewish parties, and by the classical elegance of the whole phrase.

(γ) *The Healing of the Multitudes and the Ordination of the Twelve.*

ST. MATTHEW xii. 15-21.

And Jesus perceiving *it* withdrew from thence: and many followed him; and he healed them all, and charged them that they should not make him known: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying,

Behold, my servant whom I have chosen;

My beloved in whom my soul is well pleased:

I will put my Spirit upon him,

And he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles.

He shall not strive, nor cry aloud;

Neither shall any one hear his voice in the streets.

A bruised reed shall he not break,

And smoking flax shall he not quench,

Till he send forth judgement unto victory.

ST. MARK iii. 7-19.

And Jesus with his disciples withdrew to the sea: and a great multitude from Galilee followed: and from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a great multitude, hearing what great things he did, came unto him. And he spake to his disciples, that a little boat should wait on him because of the crowd, lest they should throng him: for he had healed many; insomuch that as many as had plagues pressed upon him that they might touch him. And the unclean spirits, whensoever they beheld him, fell down before him, and cried, saying, Thou art the Son of God. And he charged them much that they should not make him known.

And he goeth up into the mountain, and calleth unto him

ST. LUKE vi. 12-19.

And it came to pass in these days, that he went out into the mountain to pray; and he continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called his disciples: and he chose from them twelve, whom also he named apostles; Simon, whom he also named Peter, and Andrew his brother, and James and John, and Philip and Bartholomew, and Matthew and Thomas, and James *the son* of Alphæus, and Simon which was called the Zealot, and Judas *the son* of James, and Judas Iscariot, which was the traitor; and he came down with them, and stood on a level place, and a great multitude of his disciples, and a great number of the people from all Judæa and Jerusalem, and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon, which came to

(γ) The Healing of the Multitudes and Ordination of the Twelve.

<p>And in his name shall the Gentiles hope.</p>	<p>whom he himself would; and they went unto him. And he appointed twelve, that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out devils: and Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the <i>son</i> of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and them he surnamed Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder: and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the <i>son</i> of Alphæus, and Thaddæus, and Simon the Cananæan, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him.</p>	<p>hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were troubled with unclean spirits were healed. And all the multitude sought to touch him: for power came forth from him, and healed <i>them</i> all.</p>
---	--	--

St. Matthew states briefly the retirement of Jesus, the healing of the multitudes, the charge of silence imposed on them, and the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, which he quotes in the Jewish form, "which was *spoken* by Esaias the prophet" (xii. 17-21). St. Mark omits the prophecy, but gives many other details; that Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea of Galilee, that the multitudes came from Jerusalem, Idumea, and Perea, and even from Tyre and Sidon, that he ordered a small vessel to wait on him, that the diseased pressed on him, to touch him, and that many dispossessions took place at the same time. In St. Matthew the Mission of the Twelve is anticipated (chap. x. 1-5), for a special purpose, and their ordination is merely alluded to, as already past. St. Mark has here restored it to its true place, which he fixes by the previous ascent into the mountain, and the entrance afterwards into the house—two particulars that imply an exact and full knowledge of the event. In Matthew, Simon is called the first; but in Mark's gospel, as writing under Peter's own

direction, this honour is merely implied, and not openly expressed, and the distinction of his surname is made less conspicuous, by mention of the common title given to the sons of Zebedee. Matthew is named before Thomas, the title of publican is omitted, and the name Lebbeus is replaced by Thaddeus, which in Matthew is simply a surname.

St. Luke, again, having confirmed the order of the two others, in the passage through the corn-fields and the cure of the withered hand, omits the third event, which they have in common, and confirms St. Mark, where he stood alone, in the ascent into the mountain, and the place and time of the apostle's ordination. Yet his account is too distinct to have been borrowed from the other. The surname of Simon the Cananæan is given in its Greek form. Thaddeus is called Judas, as he is still later by St. John. He is called the brother of James (for that is certainly the true, as well as the usual supplement); and this implies that James the Less had become more prominent in the church, when St. Luke wrote, than at the date of the two other gospels. All these minute features confirm the true place of his narrative, as the third in order of time.

II. The Sermon in St. Luke (vi. 20-49), compared with the one in St. Matthew (v.-vii.), is the next subject for inquiry. Most recent critics, as Neander, Olshausen, Wieseler, and Robinson, view them as the same. Neander remarks further, that if Luke vi. 13 is meant to recite the choosing of the apostles, it is clearly not in chronological order. But if the evangelist be a credible witness, the very reverse is perfectly clear. No sentence could be framed so as to mark an immediate sequence more evidently, and a comparison of the whole context with the two other gospels proves decisively the regularity of this whole chapter of St. Luke.

The following reasons are given for the identity. The choice of the Twelve was a fit occasion for the discourse in St. Matthew, and the passages (Matthew v. 13, 14-vii. 6) seem to allude to their appointment. The beginning and end of the Sermon, and the general course of thought, are

2. The two
Sermons,
St. Matthew
v.-vii., St.
Luke vi.

the same in both gospels. The entrance into Capernaum follows in each case, and the cure of the centurion's servant. Two opposite explanations are also proposed of the difference between them. Some have thought that St. Luke omits the exposition of the Mosaic law, as less suitable to Gentile converts; while others suppose that Matthew has grouped together many sayings, that were really uttered at other times, and which St. Luke has given elsewhere in their true place. The expression "on the plain" should rather be translated "on a level spot," and hence the contrast in the place where the discourse was spoken disappears; since that spot might be on the mountain side. For these reasons the more general opinion of recent critics has been, that we have two reports of the same discourse, and that St. Luke has given it in its true order.

The two are
not identical.

The following reasons may be offered for the opposite view, which maintains the distinctness of the two sermons. First, there is nothing improbable in the recurrence of similar discourses in our Lord's ministry. On the contrary, a partial repetition, in many cases, is morally certain. Almost every day, for three years, was employed in teaching his disciples or the multitudes. His journeys had a wide circuit, through hundreds of towns or villages, and the hearers must have been often changing. Three or four circuits of Galilee are expressly named in the gospels. Many shorter sayings are repeated, even in the same gospel, and still more, when different gospels are compared together. Hence the same principle may well apply to longer discourses, if many of the hearers were different, and a considerable time had intervened.

The Sermon in St. Luke is clearly in its true place, and the question is whether the account in St. Matthew be an anticipation of the real time. In this case, St. Matthew will have passed over more than a year of our Saviour's ministry, without recording more than one fact, the call of the four disciples, and the general remark, that Jesus made a circuit through Galilee. This seems very improbable.

The context, in the first gospel, seems to place the discourse at the close of a first circuit of Galilee. No time

could be more suitable for a formal and open proclamation of our Lord's doctrine, and of its relation to the law of Moses and the prophets. On the contrary, such an explanation would come very late, when the second Passover had been past for some time, and our Lord had completed more than a whole year of his public ministry.

The arrangement, also, as it now stands, seems to be confirmed by the two other gospels. After the return to Galilee in all, the visit to Nazareth in Luke only, and the removal to Capernaum, we have this succession :—

<i>M.</i> Call of the Four Disciples.	<i>MK.</i> Call of the Four Disciples.	
	Dispossession at Capernaum.	<i>L.</i> Dispossession at Capernaum.
	Simon's wife's mother, etc.	Simon's wife's mother, etc.
Circuit of Galilee.	Circuit of Galilee, and <i>preaching</i> .	Circuit of Galilee, and <i>preaching</i> .
Sermon on the Mount.		Miraculous Draught.
The Leper cleansed.	The Leper cleansed.	The Leper cleansed.

Thus the events before and after will refer the Sermon to a much earlier place than the one in St. Luke, and which would answer to Mark i. 29, Luke iv. 44, in the two other gospels. The astonishment of the multitudes at the close also confirms this earlier date. We find its counterpart in Mark i. 22, Luke iv. 32, after the first instance of public teaching at Capernaum. If the Sermon belonged really to the first circuit of Galilee, the remark would be far more appropriate than if upwards of a year had now passed from the opening of our Lord's ministry.

The resemblance in the occasion of each discourse will not prove them the same, though each were given on the side of the mountain, near Capernaum. The natural impression left by the two accounts is different. In one case, our Lord seems to have retired, simply to avoid the pressure of the multitude. Having seated himself in a convenient place, his disciples drew near, and the rest stood at a greater distance, while he taught them. In St. Luke the whole night had been spent in the mountain; the disciples drew

near at daybreak, and the Twelve were chosen. Our Lord then came down to a lower and level place, and addressed his disciples, standing, in audience of the multitude. The discourse in St. Matthew is three times as long as in St. Luke; and it is clear that the posture of sitting and standing, in each case, agrees thoroughly with this difference between them.

The variations might be explained, in part, by the special object of each writer, but are scarcely explicable by this reason alone. They suit well with two successive periods in our Lord's ministry. In St. Matthew, the beatitudes are nine in number, abstract in their form, and stand alone. In St. Luke they are only four, are concrete and personal, being a direct address to the disciples, and are followed by as many woes. After the first year, the opposition of the Jews to our Lord was more overt and persevering, and hence it was natural that warnings should be more prominent, along with invitations and blessings. It is not likely that St. Luke would insert woes that were not then uttered, or that the woes did not answer to the blessings, or that St. Matthew has doubled the number of our Lord's beatitudes, or that nine woes followed nine blessings. If none of these alternatives be true, the discourses must clearly have been different. The portion in Matthew v. 17-43, beginning with the words, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets" is suitable to an early period, when Jesus had not yet stated clearly the relation in which he stood to Moses and the previous dispensation, and would be less likely to appear in any later repetition. Again, Luke vi. 27-38, compared with Matthew v. 42-48, vii. 1, 2, is not at all like a verbally altered extract of the same discourse, but a selection of two main ideas out of many, which are then amplified, and combined in a different order. The tone, in St. Matthew, is one of calmness and royal majesty; in St. Luke, of deep earnestness, prophetic energy, and pressing entreaty. In one we see a lawgiver delivering public statutes; in the other, an affectionate teacher, who redoubles his exhortations to beloved disciples, and warns them against urgent and threatening evils. This

contrast is very clear in Luke vi. 32-34, 37, 38, compared with the passages in the first gospel. Even the caution at the close (Matt. vii. 21) is turned from an abstract lesson into an earnest reproof of actual disobedience (Luke vi. 46), "But why call ye me Lord, Lord?" etc. The parable in Luke vi. 39 has every mark of being inserted, because it was actually spoken at the time, though its connection is rather obscure at first sight. In St. Matthew it is only found much later, and in a context still more plainly historical.

From these remarks it seems to follow that the two discourses were really distinct; that the earlier of them, in St. Matthew, took place in the middle of the first year, at the close of the first general circuit of Galilee; that the other took place late in the spring, or early in the summer, of the second year, after a partial circuit around the sea of Tiberias; that the first of them was followed by the miraculous draught, and the healing of the leper; and the second by the cure of the Centurion's servant, when our Lord returned from the mountain to Capernaum. Hence it would seem that St. Luke, who passes by the first, and records the second, wrote after St. Matthew, and was acquainted with his gospel, so as purposely to select the later discourse, because the earlier and fuller, of the same general character, had been already given.

III. The seventh chapter of St. Luke contains four events, two of which have been also recorded by St. Matthew, and the two others are found here only. The healing of the Centurion's servant is the first incident, omitted by St. Mark; and St. Luke has restored it in its true place, after the Ordination of the Twelve, and is careful to mark its order, by mentioning the occurrences of the very next day. The purpose of confirming the two other gospels would clearly require the insertion of the chief events, which were peculiar to one of them only. The message of John the Baptist has this character, as in previous chapters, the dispossession at Capernaum, the early retirement the next morning, and the ordination of the apostles, are common to St. Mark and St. Luke only.

3. St. Luke
vii.

(a) The Centurion's servant.

The story of the Centurion's servant stands thus in the two gospels:—

ST. MATTHEW viii. 5-13.

And when he was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him, and saying, Lord, my servant lieth in the house sick of the palsy, grievously tormented. And he saith unto him, I will come and heal him. And the centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but only say the word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. And when Jesus heard it, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And the servant was healed in that hour.

ST. LUKE vii. 1-10.

And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and at the point of death. And when he heard concerning Jesus, he sent unto him elders of the Jews, asking him that he would come and save his servant. And they, when they came to Jesus, besought him earnestly, saying, He is worthy that thou shouldest do this for him: for he loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue. And Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say the word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under myself soldiers: and I say to this one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. And when Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned and said unto the multitude that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole.

Here we may see the freedom of St. Luke, in revising and amplifying the brief statement in the first gospel. The words of Jesus, and of the message, are almost exactly the same, but the rest is quite different in phraseology, and the fresh details modify the account of St. Matthew by a very important change. The Centurion, according to St. Luke, did not apply in person, but by elders of the Jews, who reported his good deeds to the Jewish people. "For

he loveth our nation, and himself built us the synagogue." He also sent another message, when our Lord was drawing near to his house, and the description which closes the whole narrative is cast in a form entirely new. Yet the message and reply are nearly word for word the very same. In these it seems plain that the third gospel has retained the very words of the first, with scarcely an alteration. But in the details which precede and follow, the writer has expounded what was obscure in the brief account of St. Matthew, and enlarged it into a fuller narrative.

The resemblance is equally close in the account of John's message, and is the more remarkable from the greater length of the whole passage. (β) The Message of the Baptist.

ST. MATTHEW xi. 2-19.

Now when John heard in the prison the works of the Christ, he sent by his disciples, and said unto him, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me.

And as these went their way, Jesus began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out for to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings' houses. But wherefore went ye out? to

ST. LUKE vii. 18-35.

And the disciples of John told him of all these things. And John calling unto him two of his disciples sent them to the Lord, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another? And when the men were come unto him, they said, John the Baptist hath sent us unto thee, saying, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another? In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits; and on many that were blind he bestowed sight. And he answered and said unto them, Go your way, and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he, whosoever shall find none occasion of stumbling in me.

And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to say unto the multitudes concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness to behold? a reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings'

see a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. This is he, of whom it is written,

Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,

Who shall prepare thy way before thee.

Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And if ye are willing to receive *it*, this is Elijah, which is to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear. But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the market-places, which call unto their fellows, and say, We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not mourn. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! And wisdom is justified by her works.

courts. But what went ye out to see? a prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. This is he of whom it is written,

Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,

Who shall prepare thy way before thee.

I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there is none greater than John: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of God is greater than he. And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him. Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation, and to what are they like? They are like unto children that sit in the marketplace, and call one to another; which say, We piped unto you, and ye did not dance; we wailed, and ye did not weep. For John the Baptist is come eating no bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold, a gluttonous man, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! And wisdom is justified of all her children.

The verbal resemblance in these passages, extending through many verses, and to the minutest terms of expression, is so close, as to prove that one writer has adopted the account of the other. In thirty-five clauses the only difference consists in two verses being changed, two verses and four single words inserted, and one phrase and one word being substituted for another synonymous. The mutual connection of the two accounts is thus perfectly clear.

The slight changes, however, all indicate that St. Luke's is the later narrative. The introduction in St. Matthew, where the passage is out of order, is abrupt. "Now when

John heard in the prison the works of Christ." In St. Luke it flows out of the connection with the previous incidents. "And the disciples of John told him of all these things. And John calling unto him two of his disciples," etc. St. Matthew, with his usual brevity, puts the message into the mouth of the Baptist himself. St. Luke distinguishes the message and its actual delivery, and reports the very words by which the messengers introduce it. St. Matthew leaves it implied, from the answer of Jesus, that cures were wrought in their presence. St. Luke states the fact distinctly, before the reply is given. "In the same hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits, and to many that were blind he gave sight." The present tense of Matthew is changed for the past, the proper tense of history. "Tell John the things ye have seen and heard." The phrase "they that wear soft raiment," is elegantly paraphrased: "they that are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately." The word Amen (v. 11), so thoroughly Hebrew, is omitted. It occurs only eight times in St. Luke, and more than thirty times in St. Matthew.

The four next verses, in St. Matthew, allude to the law, the prophets, and a prediction of Malachi respecting Elijah. In their stead St. Luke introduces a parenthesis of his own (verses 29, 30), to explain the reproof of Jesus which follows them. Since he had before mentioned the general acceptance of John's ministry, his statement, ch. iii. 15, and the rebuke of our Lord, might have seemed inconsistent, without such an explanation. Again, the account of the Baptist, that he came "neither eating nor drinking," is partly explained in St. Matthew by ch. iii. 4, "his meat was locusts and wild honey." St. Luke, who has not alluded to this circumstance, gives here a brief exposition of our Lord's meaning: "For John the Baptist is come eating no bread, nor drinking wine." It seems thus clear, from the whole passage, that St. Luke has revised and slightly altered the earlier narrative of St. Matthew.

The two other portions of the same chapter, the raising of the Widow's Son (St. Luke vii. 11-19), and the anointing in the house of the Pharisee (St. Luke vii. 36-50), are

(γ) The
Widow's Son
and the
Anointing in
the House of
the Pharisee.

equally conclusive for the originality of the third gospel. They show that the writer, while proved otherwise to be acquainted with the two earlier gospels, was not dependent on them, but had direct and separate sources of information. The former has all the marks of regular and orderly history in its first opening. "It came to pass, the day after, that he journeyed to a city called Nain." And the notice is the more striking, as the name of the place, though little visited, has survived to the present day. The account has the vivid features, which imply the report of an eye-witness; while the clause in the answer to John's disciples, "the dead are raised," receives from it a direct explanation. For here the raising of the Ruler's Daughter, placed earlier than that message by St. Matthew, though really later, has been restored, as in St. Mark, to its true historical position.

The anointing has some features of resemblance to the one at Bethany, recorded in the three other gospels, and hence some have sought to identify them, so that the accuracy of all the accounts might be disproved. But in reality, the diversity is more striking than the partial resemblance. In time, in place, in the character of the woman, the person of the complainant, the answer of our Lord, the parting promise to the woman, and even in the extent of the anointing, there is an entire contrast.

No single gospel has recorded both of these events, and their general similarity will account for the omission. The more important of them would be likely to be first put on record, and a later gospel would then, for variety, be just as likely to insert the other only. Now the anointing at Bethany, though later in time, was far more prominent in our Lord's history. It occurred in the week before his Passion, was an occasion for the treachery of Judas, and was joined with a direct promise to Mary of lasting honour. The promise would naturally secure a place for the event in the earliest gospel. After St. Matthew and St. Mark had both recorded it, St. Luke might well prefer to mention the earlier anointing, itself also full of deep interest; and St. John, last of all, supplies further details of the more

important event, to complete the account in the earlier gospels.

IV. The events of the Circuit, with the Teaching in Parables, are the next portion to be compared. After the ordination of the Twelve, St. Mark recounts the gathering of multitudes again, the message of our Lord's relatives, the Discourse on blasphemy, though in an abridged form, the visit of our Lord's mother and brethren, and the teaching in Parables, in all which events the order is the same as in St. Matthew. Of the seven Parables, however, in the first gospel, only two are given, and two other new ones are added. The agreement in the general succession is complete.

The interval, however, must have been considerable, between the second-first Sabbath, when the corn was ripening, and the seed-time, which we may reasonably presume to have come, when the parable of the sower was given. St. Luke, accordingly, after the Ordination of the Twelve, and the sermon of that day, supplies other events; the healing of the Centurion's servant, the visit to him, the message of John the Baptist, the anointing in some city, and last of all, another circuit of Galilee, through every city and village. This last explains the interval of time, which is not filled up in the earlier gospels; while the mention, by name, of the women who attended our Lord, is a fresh proof of the writer's original and independent information.

The discourse on blasphemy would follow next, since both St. Matthew and St. Mark place it earlier in the same day with the parable of the sower. But St. Luke has a similar event to record considerably later, and therefore passes it in silence. The omission leads to another slight change, as the visit of our Lord's mother and brethren is placed, as in a parenthesis, after the teaching in parables, though it occurred a little earlier on the same day. The words of the gospel, however, have just the form we might expect in an exact writer, when the precise order of time was not meant to be specified. "Now there came to him his mother and his brethren."

The account of the parables, in the third gospel, accords

4. The events from the Appointment of the Twelve to the Teaching by Parables. St. Luke viii. 1-21.

with the principle, that one main purpose was the confirmation of both the earlier narratives. The first and most prominent of those in St. Matthew is given, and one of the two which is peculiar to St. Mark, but no others. In phraseology, St. Mark follows St. Matthew closely, but St. Luke varies from both in almost every clause, and the parable, common to him with St. Mark only, is expressed with a classic elegance of style.

In the parable of the Sower, St. Mark adheres, word for word, to St. Matthew, with only two or three slight variations (see pp. 26, 27). The singular and plural, in the Greek, are interchanged, and the order, in verse 8, is reversed, so as to exhibit a climax—"some thirty, some sixty, and some an hundred." This clearly increases the emphasis of the passage. St. Luke, who here studies brevity, gives only the highest number—"and bare fruit an hundred-fold."

5. St. Luke
viii. 22-56.

V. The Voyage and the Return, with the raising of the Ruler's Daughter, are found in all the three gospels, but with important differences between St. Matthew and the two others. The whole account, Matt. viii. 23-ix. 1, and ix. 18-26; Mark iv. 35-v. 43; Luke viii. 22-56, will throw much light on the mutual relation of the three narratives.

It has been already shown, by weighty reasons, that St. Mark has here restored the true order, from which St. Matthew had deviated, by inserting the Cure of the Paralytic, and his own call, between the return from Gadara and the healing of Jairus' daughter. The close resemblance of St. Mark and St. Luke, throughout, is a clear sign that one was acquainted with the work of the other, while a minute comparison will prove that St. Luke's is the later and revised narrative.

1. The Account of the Storm stands thus in the three gospels:—

ST. MATTHEW viii.
23-27.

And when he was entered into a boat, his disciples followed him.

ST. MARK iv. 35-41.

And on that day, when even was come, he saith unto them, Let us go over unto

ST. LUKE viii. 22-25.

Now it came to pass on one of those days, that he entered into a boat, himself and his

(a) The Account of the Storm.

And behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, in so much that the boat was covered with the waves: but he was asleep. And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Save, Lord; we perish. And he saith unto them, Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith? Then he arose, and rebuked the winds and the sea; and there was a great calm. And the men marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?

the other side. And leaving the multitude, they take him with them, even as he was, in the boat. And other boats were with him. And there ariseth a great storm of wind, and the waves beat into the boat, in so much that the boat was now filling. And he himself was in the stern, asleep on the cushion: and they awake him, and say unto him, Master, carest thou not that we perish? And he awoke, and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, Peace, be still. And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm. And he said unto them, Why are ye fearful? have ye not yet faith? And they feared exceedingly, and said one to another, Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?

disciples; and he said unto them, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake: and they launched forth. But as they sailed he fell asleep: and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filling *with water*, and were in jeopardy. And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Master, master, we perish. And he awoke, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water: and they ceased, and there was a calm. And he said unto them, Where is your faith? And being afraid they marvelled, saying one to another, Who then is this, that he commandeth even the winds and the water, and they obey him?

In St. Luke viii. 22, the entrance into the ship is given nearly in the words of St. Matthew, the order to cross over in those of St. Mark, but with a slight change, indicative of a later composition. St. Matthew,¹ who was present, and St. Mark the interpreter of St. Peter, mention definitely "the boat," but St. Luke, as a mere historian, and not an eye-witness, drops the article. St. Matthew says that the disciples followed Jesus; St. Mark, that they took him into the ship as he was. Probably St. Peter and the sons of Zebedee would be already in the vessel, and St.

¹ The Revisers have dropped the article in St. Matthew, though as the majority of cursive MSS., whose value my father thought they greatly under-rated, retain it, I do not think he would have held with them.—ED.

Matthew and the rest would follow. St. Luke, avoiding this minute contrast, says simply that "he entered the ship, and his disciples," and makes the addition, to remove a provincial idiom, that would be obscure to readers out of Palestine—"Let us cross over to the other side OF THE LAKE." He mentions the sleep of Jesus in the order of its occurrence, while the others notice it only at the moment of the disciples' alarm. His description is combined from theirs—the squall of wind (λαίλαψ ἀνέμου) from St. Mark, its effect on the water from St. Matthew, the participle, "coming to him" (προσελθόντες), from St. Matthew, the verb, διήγειραν, intermediate between ἡγειραν and διεγείρουσι in the others. The graphic account of their situation, "the ship was covered with waves," "the waves kept beating into the ship, so that it was now full," are replaced by the simpler statement, "they were filled, and were in danger." The place of the rebuke is the same as in St. Mark, after the storm is laid. The words, "he arose and rebuked the wind," are common to all, but St. Luke substitutes for the mention of *the sea*, a name which he never gives to the lake of Tiberias, a classical paraphrase, "the raging of the water" (κλύδωνι τῶν ὕδατος). The wonder, in St. Matthew (ἐθαύμασαν), and the fear, expressed by St. Mark in a Hebrew idiom (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν), are both combined in the classical phrase (φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν). The first part of the exclamation is exactly the same as in St. Mark, who varies slightly from the first gospel. There is no part of St. Luke's description which is not found in one of the others, and words are borrowed from each with very slight variation. But the minuter details of St. Mark are omitted, one incident is restored to its actual order, a more classic title is given to the lake of Tiberias, a Hebraism is dropped at the close, and the fear and wonder, separately reported by the others, are here combined together. All these are signs that St. Luke was acquainted with the two other gospels, and used them freely, though without a servile dependence on them, in the composition of his later and more finished narrative.

ST. MATT. viii. 28-34.

And when he was come to the other side into the country of the Gadarenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming forth out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man could pass by that way. And behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time? Now there was afar off from them a herd of many swine feeding. And the devils besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, send us away into the herd of swine. And he said unto them, Go. And they came out, and went into the swine: and behold, the whole herd rushed down the steep into the sea, and perished in the waters. And they that fed them fled, and went away into the city, and told everything, and what was befallen to them that were possessed with devils. And behold, all the city came out to meet Jesus: and when they saw him, they besought him that he would depart from their borders.

ST. MARK v. 1-20.

And they came to the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gerasenes. And when he was come out of the boat, straightway there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit, who had his dwelling in the tombs: and no man could any more bind him, no, not with a chain; because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been rent asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces: and no man had strength to tame him. And always, night and day, in the tombs and in the mountains, he was crying out, and cutting himself with stones. And when he saw Jesus from afar, he ran and worshipped him; and crying out with a loud voice, he saith, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I adjure thee by God, torment me not. For he said unto him, Come forth, thou unclean spirit, out of the man. And he asked him, What is thy name? and he saith unto him, My name is Legion; for we are many. And he besought him much that he would not send them away out of the country. Now there was there on the mountain side a great herd of swine feeding. And

ST. LUKE viii. 26-39.

And they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is over against Galilee. And when he was come forth upon the land, there met him a certain man out of the city, who had devils; and for a long time he had worn no clothes, and abode not in any house, but in the tombs. And when he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God? I beseech thee, torment me not. For he commanded the unclean spirit to come out from the man. For oftentimes it had seized him: and he was kept under guard, and bound with chains and fetters; and breaking the bands asunder, he was driven of the devil into the deserts. And Jesus asked him, What is thy name? And he said, Legion; for many devils were entered into him. And they intreated him that he would not command them to depart into the abyss. Now there was there a herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they intreated him that he would give them leave to enter into them. And he gave them leave. And the devils came out from the man, and entered into the

they besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them. And he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered into the swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the sea, *in number* about two thousand; and they were choked in the sea. And they that fed them fled, and told it in the city, and in the country. And they came to see what it was that had come to pass. And they come to Jesus, and behold him that was possessed with devils sitting, clothed and in his right mind, *even* him that had the legion: and they were afraid. And they that saw it declared unto them how it befell him that was possessed with devils, and concerning the swine. And they began to beseech him to depart from their borders. And as he was entering into the boat, he that had been possessed with devils besought him that he might be with him. And he suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go to thy house unto thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and *how* he had mercy on thee. And he went his way, and began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done for him: and all men did marvel.

swine: and the herd rushed down the steep into the lake, and were choked. And when they that fed them saw what had come to pass, they fled, and told it in the city and in the country. And they went out to see what had come to pass; and they came to Jesus, and found the man, from whom the devils were gone out, sitting, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus: and they were afraid. And they that saw it told them how he that was possessed with devils was made whole. And all the people of the country of the Gerasenes round about asked him to depart from them; for they were holden with great fear: and he entered into a boat, and returned.

But the man from whom the devils were gone out prayed him that he might be with him: but he sent him away, saying, Return to thy house, and declare how great things God hath done for thee. And he went his way, publishing throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done for him.

2. The account is given with much fuller details by St. Mark and St. Luke, than by St. Matthew. There is also another remarkable difference. For St. Matthew reports the cure of two demoniacs, while the other evangelists are agreed in speaking of one only. Several explanations have been proposed of this difficulty. It is certainly highly improbable that two demoniacs should thus by concert address the same words jointly to our Lord, or that if two were present at the same time, the other gospels should both speak of one, and in a manner quite distinctive. "He that was possessed besought Jesus, that he might be with him," etc. On the other hand, the explanation of Da Costa,¹ in his recent and interesting work, seems equally harsh and violent, that the demoniac, and some one who was seen attacked by him, were viewed together by the evangelist, and thus led him to speak of a double cure. A usual idiom and license will permit the use of the plural for the singular, in many cases, but not that two should be specified when there was really but one. Instances, however, will appear, in which St. Matthew groups events, not occurring strictly at the same moment, but of a common character, and thus compresses his narrative, retaining only the main features of the occurrence. We have only to suppose another dis-possession, which might occur during the interval before the return of the Gadarenes from the city, without the same peculiar features as the first, and it will be quite agreeable to the style of this evangelist to unite both events in one, and to ascribe jointly to the two demoniacs the incidents which, in strictness of speech, belonged to one of them alone. It would then be in harmony with the purpose of the later gospels to single out the more important and characteristic event, and give it with full detail, and to omit entirely all reference to the other. In the two thieves we have a very similar instance. Had only one thief been crucified with our Lord, the phrase would be most unnatural; but it is easy to understand how a fact might be ascribed to the two conjointly, which really belonged to one of them alone.²

¹ "Four Witnesses," p. 60 fg.

² Of course by those who oppose the theory of mutual succession it

3. The comparison of the two accounts in St. Mark and St. Luke will serve to prove their connection, and ascertain their real order.

Here, with one slight exception, the order of every clause is the same from first to last. The verbal correspondence is always considerable, and in sixty or seventy words is exact. Yet the variations are not such as to be explained by translation from a common original. They indicate rather a free revision, with a view to some special purpose of the later narrative.

The first change is in the geographical phraseology. Instead of "the other side of the sea, the country of the Gerasenes," we have an expression freed from the provincial idiom—"the country of the Gerasenes, which is over against Galilee." It is clear that the phrase in St. Mark is natural for a Galilean writer, but the one in St. Luke is better suited for readers remote from Palestine.

The next change is the omission of the adverb, *ἐνθὺς*, which is so frequent in St. Mark as to be idiomatic. The mention of the tombs, to a stranger, would be very abrupt. Hence St. Luke first describes the man by his original home, "a man out of the city," then by his distressing state, "he had devils," and then by consequence of this long possession, his naked condition, and mournful dwelling in the tombs.

The other variations tend to the same object, and adapt the narrative for readers less familiar with the idiom of Palestine. Instead of "he worshipped him," we have the equivalent, "he fell down before him." Instead of the adjuration, we have the simpler address, "I beseech thee." The charge to the unclean spirits is given in the indirect form, which is more usual in general history. The unhappy state of the man is brought into causal connection with the words of our Lord by a slight transposition, so as to show the urgency of the case, and the compassion of Jesus. The

will be said that if St. Luke and St. Mark had the account of Matthew before them, why did they gratuitously introduce a difficulty by mentioning but one demoniac. Perhaps the remarks in my preface may be a sufficient reply.—ED.

number of the devils is stated by the writer, instead of being given as part of their reply. The request, not to "send them out of the country," receives a striking exposition of its true meaning, "that he would not command them to depart into the abyss." The mountain is named, in its historical connection, as the feeding place of the swine, which removes the seeming abruptness in the second gospel. The exact number of the herd is omitted, as a needless detail; the phrase, "came out," is rendered plainer; *sea* is changed to *lake*, or omitted; and all besides is verbally the same. The double description, "the man possessed, and that had the legion" is replaced by one of a simpler kind, "the man from whom the devils were gone out," and a minute grace is given to the narrative, by the remark that he was sitting "at the feet of Jesus." All these changes imply a revision of St. Mark's narrative, by which it is rendered more suitable for general readers out of Palestine; but will not agree with the hypothesis of two translations from the same original, and still less with their derivation, quite independently of each other, from oral tradition alone.

The account of the Raising of Jairus' Daughter follows thus :—

(γ) The Ruler's Daughter.

ST. MATTHEW ix.
18-26.

Behold, there came a ruler, and worshipped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live. And Jesus arose, and followed him, and so *did* his disciples. And behold, a woman, who had an issue of blood twelve years, came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: for she said within herself, If I do but touch his garment, I shall be made whole. But Jesus turn-

ST. MARK v. 21-43.

And when Jesus had crossed over again in the boat unto the other side, a great multitude was gathered unto him: and he was by the sea. And there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and seeing him, he falleth at his feet, and beseecheth him much, saying, My little daughter is at the point of death: *I pray thee*, that thou come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be made whole,

ST. LUKE viii. 40-56.

And as Jesus returned, the multitude welcomed him; for they were all waiting for him. And behold, there came a man named Jairo, and he was a ruler of the synagogue: and he fell down at Jesus' feet, and besought him to come into his house; for he had an only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying. But as he went the multitudes thronged him.

And a woman having an issue of blood

ing and seeing her, said, Daughter, be of good cheer; thy faith hath made thee whole. And the woman was made whole from that hour. And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the flute-players, and the crowd making a tumult, he said, Give place: for the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn. But when the crowd was put forth, he entered in, and took her by the hand; and the damsel arose. And the fame hereof went forth into all that land.

and live. And he went with him; and a great multitude followed him, and they thronged him.

And a woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse, having heard the things concerning Jesus, came in the crowd behind, and touched his garment. For she said, If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole. And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of her plague. And straightway Jesus, perceiving in himself that the power *proceeding* from him had gone forth, turned him about in the crowd, and said, Who touched my garments? And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me? And he looked round about to see her that had done this thing. But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what had been done to her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.

twelve years, which had spent all her living upon physicians, and could not be healed of any, came behind him, and touched the border of his garment: and immediately the issue of her blood stanch'd. And Jesus said, Who is it that touched me? And when all denied, Peter said, and they that were with him, Master, the multitudes press thee and crush thee. But Jesus said, Some one did touch me: for I perceived that power had gone forth from me. And when the woman saw that she was not hid, she came trembling, and falling down before him declared in the presence of all the people for what cause she touched him, and how she was healed immediately. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace.

While he yet spake, there cometh one from the ruler of the synagogue's house, saying, Thy daughter is dead; trouble not the Master. But Jesus hearing it, answered him, Fear not: only believe, and she shall be made whole. And when he came to the house, he suffered not any man to enter in with him, save Peter, and John, and James, and the father of the maiden and her mother. And all were

While he yet spake, they come from the ruler of the synagogue's *house*, saying, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further? But Jesus, not heeding the word spoken, saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Fear not, only believe. And he suffered no man to follow with him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James. And they come to the house of the ruler of the synagogue; and he beholdeth a tumult, and *many* weeping and wailing greatly. And when he was entered in, he saith unto them, Why make ye a tumult, and weep? the child is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn. But he, having put them all forth, taketh the father of the child and her mother and them that were with him, and goeth in where the child was. And taking the child by the hand, he saith unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, Arise. And straightway the damsel rose up, and walked; for she was twelve years old. And they were amazed straightway with a great amazement. And he charged them much that no man should know this: and he commanded that *something* should be given her to eat.

weeping, and bewailing her: but he said, Weep not; for she is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn, knowing that she was dead. But he, taking her by the hand, called, saying, Maiden, arise. And her spirit returned, and she rose up immediately: and he commanded that *something* be given her to eat. And her parents were amazed: but he charged them to tell no man what had been done.

In the narrative of the Ruler's Daughter, it is clear that St. Mark and St. Luke wrote after St. Matthew, whose brief account undergoes an important modification. But the minute differences also prove, as Dr. Townson has remarked, that St. Luke followed after St. Mark, and revised his narrative.

The words of St. Mark might be thought to signify that our Lord stopped the multitude on the way to the house, a circumstance not easy to explain without a miracle. St. Luke, by a simple change of order, removes the difficulty, and shows that all, except the three apostles, were restrained from entering the house, and from that alone.

The request of Jairus, in St. Mark, has the direct, in St. Luke the indirect form. The age of the damsel, in St. Mark, appears incidentally, upon her recovery. It is stated by St. Luke, as in regular history, when she is first mentioned, in the application for her cure. A further and touching circumstance is added, that she was an only child. The description of the woman is given by St. Luke in a more terse form of expression. The changes in verse 49 indicate a delicate revision, to secure greater elegance and perspicuity. The plural is replaced by the singular, since the message was probably brought, and clearly delivered, by one person. Ἀπὸ is altered to παρὰ, since the former, in strictness, would imply that the message came *from* the ruler, instead of coming *to* him, and *from* his house, while he was absent. The aorist ἀπέθανε is replaced by the perfect, τέθνηκε, which more forcibly implies her death as complete and irreversible. The promise, only implied in St. Mark, is distinctly expressed by St. Luke in our Lord's answer, "she shall be saved." The scornful laugh of the minstrels has its reason assigned—"knowing that she was dead." The cause of her revival is more clearly stated—"her spirit came again;" while the charge to give her food is brought into connection with her recovery. The prohibition to divulge the miracle is thus made to close the account, and forms the moral application of the whole. The Hebraism of St. Mark, in describing the parents' astonishment, is also removed. All these changes,

though separately slight, imply a later and revised composition.

VI. The following chapter of St. Luke ix. 1-50 gives many proofs of its later origin, which deserve separate notice.

VI. St. Luke
ix. 1-50.

1. The next event in St. Matthew and St. Mark is the visit to Nazareth. Of this no trace is left in the third gospel. And a simple explanation can be given of this omission. St. Luke had already supplied an account of an earlier visit, which preceded the call of the disciples, and the public teaching at Capernaum; and the same motive, which is elsewhere apparent, of avoiding the repetition of similar events, will thus explain the present omission. As for the visits themselves, which some have confounded together, the contrast between them is very manifest in many particulars.

(α) Visit to
Nazareth.

2. The Commission of the Twelve, which is given at length in St. Matthew, is related by St. Mark more briefly, but restored to its historical place after the visit to Nazareth, and before the death of the Baptist. The account in St. Luke is very similar to that in St. Mark, but some clauses resemble rather the words of the first gospel. The whole appears like a brief summary derived from the two others, as will be seen by comparing them in the original.

(β) Commis-
sion of the
Twelve.

ST. MATTHEW x. 1,
7-14.

ST. MARK vi. 6-13.

ST. LUKE ix. 1-6.

And he called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of disease, and all manner of sickness. These twelve he sent forth, and charged them, Preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick.

And he called the twelve together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.

And he charged them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no bread, no

And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick; and he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staff nor wallet, nor bread, nor money.

And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, as ye go forth of that house or that city, shake off the dust of your feet.

wallet, no money in their purse . . . and said, Put not on two coats. And he said unto them, Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide till ye depart thence.

And they went out, and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

Neither have two coats, and into whatsoever house ye enter thereabide, and thence depart; and as many as receive you not, shake off the dust from your feet for a testimony against them. And they departed, and went throughout the villages preaching the gospel, and healing everywhere.

This comparison agrees well with the supposition that St. Luke has freely combined the accounts of this charge in the two other gospels, retaining the brevity and general outline of St. Mark, but adopting some of the phrases of St. Matthew's fuller narrative.

(γ) Alarm of Herod.

3. The account of Herod's alarm is the next section of the history.

ST. MATTHEW xiv. 1-2.

At that season Herod the tetrarch heard the report concerning Jesus, and said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore do these powers work in him.

ST. MARK vi. 14-16.

And king Herod heard *thereof*; for his name had become known: and he said, John the Baptist is risen from the dead, and therefore do these powers work in him. But others said, It is Elijah. And others said, *It is* a prophet, *even* as one of the prophets. But Herod, when he heard *thereof*, said, John, whom I beheaded, he is risen.

ST. LUKE ix. 7-9.

Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done: and he was much perplexed, because that it was said by some, that John was risen from the dead; and by some, that Elijah had appeared; and by others, that one of the old prophets was risen again. And Herod said, John I beheaded: but who is this, about whom I hear such things? And he sought to see him.

Here St. Mark represents it as the deliberate opinion of Herod, that Jesus was the Baptist risen from the dead. In

St. Luke this opinion is said to be current among the people; but Herod is described as merely perplexed what judgment to form respecting the real character of Jesus. In the first surprise of these wonderful reports, a guilty conscience might lead him to suppose that St. John was indeed risen again; and when his habitual scepticism revived, he still might not be able to avoid a feeling of doubt and perplexity, which made him desirous to see Jesus. One account will thus have a dramatic, and the other, an historical truth. St. Mark will refer to the first moment of wonder and alarm; St. Luke to the tetrarch's habitual feeling, which is more suited for the record of a regular history. The closing sentence, Luke ix. 9, evidently has a prospective reference to the latter incident, xxiii. 8, and shows how far this gospel is removed from the character of a piecemeal composition. The phrase, "one of the old prophets is risen again," is a brief comment on the opinion of the people, which makes it more perspicuous to Gentile readers.

4. The Feeding of the Five Thousand is the next incident. (δ) The Five Thousand.

ST. MATTHEW xiv.
13-21.

ST. MARK vi. 32-44.

ST. LUKE ix. 10-17.

Now when Jesus heard *it*, he withdrew from thence in a boat, to a desert place apart: and when the multitudes heard *thereof*, they followed him on foot from the cities. And he came forth, and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, and healed their sick. And when even was come, the disciples came to him, saying, The place is desert, and the time is already past; send the multitudes away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves food. But Jesus said unto them,

And they went away in the boat to a desert place apart. And *the people* saw them going, and many knew *them*, and they ran there together on foot from all the cities, and outwent them. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd: and he began to teach them many things. And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him, and said, The place is desert, and the day is now far spent; send

And the apostles, when they were returned, declared unto him what things they had done. And he took them, and withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida. But the multitudes perceiving it followed him: and he welcomed them, and spake to them of the kingdom of God, and them that had need of healing he healed. And the day began to wear away; and the twelve came, and said unto him, Send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages and country round about, and

They have no need to go away; give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, We have here but five loaves, and two fishes. And he said, Bring them hither to me. And he commanded the multitudes to sit down on the grass; and he took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake and gave the loaves to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitudes. And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up that which remained over of the broken pieces, twelve baskets full. And they that did eat were about five thousand men, beside women and children.

them away, that they may go into the country and villages round about, and buy themselves somewhat to eat. But he answered and said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they say unto him, Shall we go and buy two hundred pennyworth of bread, and give them to eat? And he saith unto them, How many loaves have ye? go and see. And when they knew, they say, Five, and two fishes. And he commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties. And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed, and brake the loaves; and he gave to the disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all. And they did all eat, and were filled. And they took up broken pieces, twelve basketfuls, and also of the fishes. And they that ate the loaves were five thousand men.

lodge, and get victuals: for we are here in a desert place. But he said unto them, Give ye them to eat. And they said, We have no more than five loaves and two fishes; except we should go and buy food for all this people. For they were about five thousand men. And he said unto his disciples, Make them sit down in companies, about fifty each. And they did so, and made them all sit down. And he took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, he blessed them, and brake; and gave to the disciples to set before the multitude. And they did eat, and were all filled: and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets.

This has been quoted before, to prove the intimate connection between the two first gospels. The account in St. Luke is also very similar, but the changes, though slight, agree well with the idea of its later composition. St. Mark had observed, only at the close, that the disciples were sent over before unto Bethsaida. Here we read, at

the opening, that Jesus "went aside into a desert place of a city called Bethsaida." This implies a circle of readers, to whom Bethsaida of Galilee was unknown. St. Matthew has mentioned that Jesus healed the sick among the people, and St. Mark, that he taught them many things; but St. Luke has combined both particulars, in a more classical style. "And receiving them, he spake to them of the kingdom of God, and healed them that had need of healing." The time of day is expressed by a more elegant Greek idiom, and the number of those who were fed is given earlier, when the inquiry about provision was first made.

5. This miracle is followed by many events, occupying sixty-six verses in St. Matthew, and seventy-five in St. Mark, of which no trace is found in the third gospel. For this omission, the principles already laid down will give a sufficient reason. The object of confirming the testimony of the two former witnesses has now been amply fulfilled, especially as the accounts of Passion Week are naturally the same, in substance, in all the gospels. The other purpose, of supplying fresh information, becomes therefore more prominent in the rest of the gospel, and to combine this with brevity, it is natural to omit some of those portions, in which the consent of the two earlier writers renders a third witness less important. Such is eminently the character of the passages, Matt. xiv. 22—xvi. 12. Mark vi. 45—vii. 26. And besides, the similarity of the second miracle, in the feeding of the four thousand, and the special reference to Jewish customs in the discourse on tradition, would be further reasons for passing them over in this gospel for Greek converts. But the confession of Peter, the discourse on self-denial, and the transfiguration, were cardinal elements in the gospel history. If St. Luke wrote after the others, and as a supplement to their accounts, the omission of one portion, and the retention of the other, is equally explained.

(ε) Events
peculiar to
St. Matthew
and St. Mark.

6. The confession of Peter, with the discourse on self-denial, is given in all the three gospels, but with considerable variations.

(ζ) St. Peter's
Confession.

ST. MATTHEW xvi.
13-28.

Now when Jesus came into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Who do men say that the Son of man is? And they said, Some *say* John the Baptist; some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Then charged he the disciples that they should tell no man that he was the Christ.

From that time began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the

ST. MARK viii. 27-
ix. 1.

And Jesus went forth, and his disciples, into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi: and in the way he asked his disciples, saying unto them, Who do men say that I am? And they told him, saying, John the Baptist: and others, Elijah; but others, One of the prophets. And he asked them, But who say ye that I am? Peter answereth and saith unto him, Thou art the Christ. And he charged them that they should tell no man of him. And he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he spake the saying openly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. But he turning about, and seeing his disciples, rebuked Peter, and saith, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men. And he called unto him the multitude with his disciples, and said unto them, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it;

ST. LUKE ix. 18-27.

And it came to pass that as he was praying alone the disciples were with him: and he asked them, saying, Who do the multitudes say that I am? And they answering said, John the Baptist; but others *say*, Elijah; and others, that one of the old prophets is risen again. And he said unto them, But who say ye that I am? And Peter answering said, The Christ of God. But he charged them, and commanded *them* to tell this to no man; saying, The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up. And he said unto all, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose or forfeit his own self? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and *the glory* of the Father, and of

elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord : this shall never be unto thee. But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan : thou art a stumblingblock unto me : for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men. Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it : and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life ? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life ? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels ; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.

and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it. For what doth it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and forfeit his life ? For what should a man give in exchange for his life ? For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand *by*, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.

the holy angels. But I tell you of a truth, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.

St. Matthew, in this part of his gospel, has recorded fully the honourable promise made to Peter ; while St. Mark, as writing under Peter's own direction, has passed it by, and mentions only the severe rebuke he presently received. St.

Luke gives the confession briefly, as in St. Mark, and omits both the rebuke and the promise. The Hebraism "after three days," is replaced by the more exact definition of time, "on the third day." The popular notion, that Jesus was one of the prophets, is again explained more clearly, "that one of the old prophets is risen again." The allusion to that particular generation of the Jews, as sinful and adulterous, is omitted, and the Hebrew term, Amen, is replaced by the answering Greek expression. With these exceptions, which indicate an explanatory revision, the agreement is almost entire, from first to last. A clearer proof could scarcely be given, that one writer knew and adopted the account of the other, and that St. Mark was the earlier of the two writers.

(θ) The Transfiguration.

7. The Transfiguration follows in all three gospels.

ST. MATTHEW xvii. 1-13.

And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart: and he was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his garments became white as the light. And behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elijah talking with him. And Peter answered, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah. While he was yet speaking, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold, a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son,

ST. MARK ix. 2-13.

And after six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves: and he was transfigured before them: and his garments became glistering, exceeding white; so as no fuller on earth can whiten them. And there appeared unto them Elijah with Moses: and they were talking with Jesus. And Peter answereth and saith to Jesus, Rabbi, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah. For he wist not what to answer; for they became sore afraid. And there came a cloud overshadowing them: and

ST. LUKE ix. 28-36.

And it came to pass about eight days after these sayings, he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up into the mountain to pray. And as he was praying, the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment *became white and dazzling*. And behold, there talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elijah; who appeared in glory, and spake of his decease which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. Now Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep: but when they were fully awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. And it came to pass, as they were parting

in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid. And Jesus came and touched them and said, Arise, and be not afraid. And lifting up their eyes, they saw no one, save Jesus only.

And as they were coming down from the mountain, Jesus commanded them, saying, Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen from the dead. And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elijah must first come? And he answered and said, Elijah indeed cometh, and shall restore all things: but I say unto you, that Elijah is come already, and they knew him not, but did unto him whatsoever they listed. Even so shall the Son of man also suffer of them. Then understood the disciples that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.

there came a voice out of the cloud, This is my beloved Son: hear ye him. And suddenly looking round about, they saw no one any more, save Jesus only with themselves.

And as they were coming down from the mountain, he charged them that they should tell no man what things they had seen, save when the Son of man should have risen again from the dead. And they kept the saying, questioning among themselves what the rising again from the dead should mean. And they asked him, saying, The scribes say that Elijah must first come. And he said unto them, Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought? But I say unto you, that Elijah is come, and they have also done unto him whatsoever they listed, even as it is written of him.

from him, Peter said unto Jesus, Master, it is good for us to be here: and let us make three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elijah: not knowing what he said. And while he said these things, there came a cloud, and overshadowed them: and they feared as they entered into the cloud. And a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my Son, my chosen: hear ye him. And when the voice came, Jesus was found alone. And they held their peace, and told no man in those days any of the things which they had seen.

The account is very nearly the same in St. Mark and St. Matthew. The variations in St. Luke are considerable, and the conversation about Elias is omitted altogether. The interval, instead of six, is said to be "as it were eight days."¹ The apostles are named in a different order,

¹ This difference of numbers appears to me almost conclusive evidence that St. Luke did not compose his gospel with the two others "open before him," referring to them for every incident. The remark

“Peter, and John, and James,” implying a later date, when the younger apostle was better known. The expression “transfigured,” which the heathen applied so often to their fabulous gods, is replaced by a paraphrase, “the fashion of his countenance was altered.” Moses and Elias are introduced, as names less familiarly known than in the other gospels. “There talked with him two men, which were Moses and Elijah.” The subject of their conversation is reported, the approaching death of Jesus at Jerusalem. The sleepiness of the disciples is noticed, and their success in resisting it, which adds a fresh moral beauty to the description. The succession of incidents is also given with touches of minute accuracy, more than in the other gospels. These characters seem to imply, not a simple revision of their accounts, but a further and original report, which must probably have been obtained from another of the three apostles. It may be viewed as almost certain, that Matthew and Mark derived theirs from St. Peter, and this may account for the want of fuller expansion in the second, compared with the first gospel. When St. Luke wrote, James had certainly been dead many years, and hence the only other informant would be St. John. The character of St. Luke’s narrative appears to agree well with the supposition, that it was drawn from this new source.

(17) The Dis-
possession,
and instruc-
tions follow-
ing.

8. In the account of the Dispossession, St. Luke is briefer than St. Mark. And he omits to mention the question in the house recorded by the earlier evangelists. But the portion that follows, more briefly given in St. Matthew, exhibits the close relation between the second and third gospels.

is important, for those who reject the theory of mutual succession often assume that this and no other was the mode of it. It may be that single expressions of my father in the comparison preceding, appear to favour such a view. I have not ventured to alter them, although I do not think my father ever adopted such a theory. It is plain that strong unconscious influence may often produce the very same effects as most elaborate and conscious art. And still behind the human workman was the Divine Disposer of his work.—Ed.

ST. MATTHEW xvii. 22-23; xviii. 1-5.

And while they abode in Galilee Jesus said, The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised up. And they were exceedingly sorry. * * *
(Incident at Capernaum.)

In that hour came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And he called to him a little child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye turn and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me.

ST. MARK ix. 30-40.

And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it. For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and when he is killed, after three days he shall rise again. But they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask him.

And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way? But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way, who *was* the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve; and he saith unto them, If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister of all. And he took a little child, and set him in the midst of them: and taking him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

John said unto him, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name: and we forbade him, because

ST. LUKE ix. 43-50.

But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples, Let these words sink into your ears: for the Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men. But they understood not this saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it: and they were afraid to ask him about this saying.

And there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest. But when Jesus saw the reasoning of their heart, he took a little child, and set him by his side, and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this little child in my name receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me receiveth him that sent me: for he that is least among you all, the same is great.

And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbade him,

he followed not us.	because he followeth
But Jesus said, Forbid	not with us. But
him not: for there is	Jesus said unto him,
no man which shall	Forbid <i>him</i> not: for
do a mighty work in	he that is not against
my name, and be able	you is for you.
quickly to speak evil	
of me. For he that is	
not against us is for	
us.	

Here, except that one clause is omitted, and another transposed and slightly varied, and the preface thrown into a new form, the correspondence in the latter gospels is almost verbally complete. This is the more observable, because from this point St. Luke's narrative begins to proceed entirely alone, and the conversation with St. John does not appear at all in St. Matthew's gospel. If St. Mark had followed St. Luke, and borrowed the passage from him, there seems no reason why he should abstain entirely from introducing any part of the seven following chapters. It appears, then, that St. Luke has here adopted the incident from St. Mark, with no change, but a slight compression. He has thus given a parting confirmation to the testimony of the second gospel, in one of the four portions which are peculiar to it, before he enters on the other main purpose of his narrative, of imparting to the Church a variety of information which neither of his predecessors had supplied. There is thus a powerful and convincing sign that he wrote after the two other evangelists, with the double design of ratifying more fully their statements, and of enlarging the circle of the gospel narrative, by further miracles and discourses which occurred towards the close of our Saviour's ministry.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE RELATIVE ORDER OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL, AS SHOWN
BY THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. THE LAST CIRCUIT AND
JOURNEY.

AFTER the dispute at Capernaum (Luke ix. 50), the gospel of St. Luke, through many chapters, appears to diverge entirely from the two others, and proceeds alone. The events of this portion, if regular, must belong to our Lord's last journeyings; and even if partly irregular, they are placed between the dispute, Matt. xviii., and the blessing of the little children, Matt. xix. 10, where there is some interval of time implied in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's narratives. Many of the discourses, however, or separate sayings of our Lord, are nearly the same as occur elsewhere in the first gospel. And thus a double inquiry will arise, whether the events themselves are different; and if different, how this frequent correspondence between the two writers is to be explained.

First we have to inquire whether or not the discourses in that part, which resemble those in St. Matthew, are really the same. In this case, one or both of the gospels must be highly irregular. If the discourses, however, be different, each gospel may still be regular, and the comparison of similar discourses will throw further light on the order in which the two gospels were composed.

The nature and extent of the transposition, assuming the discourses to be the same, will be perceived at once from the following table, in which the section of St. Luke is given at full length, and the parallels from Matthew are placed beside it.

The section peculiar to St. Luke—containing sayings that correspond with those recorded by St. Matthew.

Are these the same or different?

Analysis of Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, showing the Corresponding Passages in Matthew's Gospel.

ST. MATTHEW.

ST. LUKE.
ix. 51-62.A Journey to
Jerusalem.Rejection by
Samaritans.Offers of
Service.The Mission of
the Seventy.

viii. 18-22.

Now when Jesus saw great multitudes about him, he gave commandment to depart unto the other side. And there came a scribe, and said unto him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. And another of the disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. But Jesus saith unto him, Follow me; and leave the dead to bury their own dead.

ix. 37-38.

The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few. Pray

And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem, and sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him, because his face was *as though he were* going to Jerusalem. And when his disciples James and John saw *this*, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them? But he turned, and rebuked them. And they went to another village.

And as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus said unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven *have* nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head. And he said unto another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. But he said unto him, Leave the dead to bury their own dead; but go thou and publish abroad the kingdom of God. And another also said, I will follow thee, Lord; but first suffer me to bid farewell to them that are at my house. But Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.

x. 1-42.

Now after these things the Lord appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself was about to come. And he said unto them, The harvest is plenteous, but the labourers are few: pray ye there-

ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers into his harvest.

x. 18.

Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves.

x. 7-14.

And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely ye received, freely give. Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses; no wallet for *your* journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff: for the labourer is worthy of his food. And into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter, search out who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go forth. And as ye enter into the house, salute it. And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, as ye go forth out of that house or that city shake off the dust of your feet.

xi. 20-24.

Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Howbeit I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgement, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt go down unto Hades: for if the mighty works had been done in Sodom which were done in thee, it would have remained until this day. Howbeit I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgement, than for thee.

fore the Lord of the harvest, that he send forth labourers into his harvest. Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs in the midst of wolves. Carry no purse, no wallet, no shoes: and salute no man on the way. And into whatsoever house ye shall enter, first say, Peace *be* to this house. And if a son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon him: but if not, it shall turn to you again. And in that same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house. And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you: and heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But into whatsoever city ye shall enter, and they receive you not, go out into the streets thereof and say, Even the dust from your city, that cleaveth to our feet, we do wipe off against you: howbeit know this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh. I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom, than for that city. Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which were done in you, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. Howbeit it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgement, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt be brought down unto Hades. He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me.

And the seventy returned with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us in thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld satan falling as lightning from

Rebuke of
Galilean
Towns.

Return of
Seventy.

Thanksgiving
of the Saviour.

xi. 25-27.

At that season Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*.

xiii. 16-17.

But blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear. For verily I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

The Lawyer's
Questions.

heaven. Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall in any wise hurt you. Howbeit in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.

In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father; for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*. And turning to the disciples, he said privately, Blessed *are* the eyes which see the things that ye see: for I say unto you, that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live. But he, desiring to justify himself, said unto Jesus, And who is my neighbour? Jesus made answer and said, A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho; and he fell among robbers, which both stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half

The Good
Samaritan.

dead. And by chance a certain priest was going down that way: and when he saw him, he passed by on the other side. And in like manner a Levite also, when he came to the place, and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was: and when he saw him, he was moved with compassion, and came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on *them* oil and wine; and he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the morrow he took out two pence, and gave them to the host, and said, Take care of him; and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee. Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among the robbers? And he said, He that shewed mercy on him. And Jesus said unto him, Go, and do thou likewise.

Now as they went on their way, he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at the Lord's feet, and heard his word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving; and she came up to him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me. But the Lord answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things: but one thing is needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part which shall not be taken away from her.

The Home at
Bethany.

vi. 9-15.

After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.

xi. 1-54.

And it came to pass, as he was praying in a certain place, that when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, even as John also

The Form of
Prayer.

The Parable of
Importunity.

Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil *one*. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

vii. 7-11.

Encourage-
ment and
Promises.

Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone; or if he shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?

xii. 22-30.

The Dumb
Demoniac.

Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the dumb man spake and saw. And all the multitudes were amazed, and said, Is this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This man doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And knowing their

taught his disciples. And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we ourselves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation.

And he said unto them, Which of you shall have a friend, and shall go unto him at midnight, and say to him, Friend, lend me three loaves; for a friend of mine is come to me from a journey, and I have nothing to set before him; and he from within shall answer and say, Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot arise and give thee? I say unto you, Though he will not rise and give him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will arise and give him as many as he needeth. And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. And of which of you that is a father shall his son ask a loaf, and he give him a stone? or a fish, and he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall *your* heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?

And he was casting out a devil *which was dumb*. And it came to pass, when the devil was gone out, the dumb man spake; and the multitudes marvelled. But some of them said, By Beelzebub the prince of the devils casteth he out devils. And others, tempting him, sought of him a sign from heaven. But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, Every

thoughts he said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan casteth out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then shall his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you. Or how can one enter into the house of the strong *man*, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong *man*? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.

xii. 43-45.

But the unclean spirit, when he is gone out of the man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest, and findeth it not. Then he saith, I will return into my house whence I came out; and when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man cometh worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this evil generation.

xii. 38-42.

Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet: for as Jonah was three

kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house *divided* against a house falleth. And if Satan also is divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out devils by Beelzebub. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you. When the strong *man* fully armed guardeth his own court, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him his whole armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. The unclean spirit when he is gone out of the man, passeth through waterless places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will turn back unto my house whence I came out. And when he is come, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh to *him* seven other spirits more evil than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man cometh worse than the first.

And it came to pass, as he said these things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.

And when the multitudes were gathering together unto him, he began to say, This generation is an evil generation: it seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of Jonah. For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to

The House
Divided.

The Strong
Man Armed.

The Unclean
Spirit seeking
Rest.

The Woman
in the Multi-
tude.

Petition for
a Sign.

days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here.

v. 15.

The Lamp
and Stand.

Neither do *men* light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house.

vi. 22.

The Single
Eye.

The lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness!

Dinner in
Pharisee's
House.

xxiii. 25, 26.

Rebuke of
Pharisees.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full from extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also.

xxiii. 23.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe

this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgement with the men of this generation, and shall condemn them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgement with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.

No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, putteth it in a cellar, neither under the bushel, but on the stand, that they which enter in may see the light. The lamp of thy body is thine eye: when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when it is evil, thy body also is full of darkness. Look therefore whether the light that is in thee be not darkness. If therefore thy whole body be full of light, having no part dark, it shall be wholly full of light, as when the lamp with its bright shining doth give thee light.

Now as he spake, a Pharisee asketh him to dine with him: and he went in, and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner. And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter; but your inward part is full of extortion and wickedness. Ye foolish ones, did not he that made the outside make the inside also? Howbeit give for alms those things which are within; and behold, all things are clean unto you.

But woe unto you Pharisees! for ye tithe the mint and rue and every herb, and pass over judge-

mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgement, and mercy, and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the other undone.

xxiii. 6, 7.

But all their works they do for to be seen of men: for they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of *their garments*, and love the chief place at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the marketplaces, and to be called of men, Rabbi.

xxiii. 27.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

xxiii. 4.

Yea, they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger.

xxiii. 29-34.

Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye build the sepulchres of the prophets, and garnish the tombs of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we should not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore ye witness to yourselves, that ye are sons of them that slew the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgement of hell? Therefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: some

ment and the love of God: but these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

Woe unto you Pharisees! for ye love the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the marketplaces. Woe unto you! for ye are as the tombs which appear not, and the men that walk over *them* know it not.

And one of the lawyers answering saith unto him, Master, in saying this thou reproachest us also. And he said, Woe unto you lawyers also! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. Woe unto you! for ye build the tombs of the prophets, and your fathers killed them. So ye are witnesses and consent unto the works of your fathers: for they killed them, and ye build *their tombs*. Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles; and *some* of them they shall kill and persecute; that the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah, who perished between the altar and the

Rebuke of
Lawyers.

Malice of
Pharisees.

of them shall ye kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation.

xxiii. 13.

But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering in to enter.

Assembling
of Multitudes.

xvi. 6.

And Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

Warnings
against
Hypocrisy.

x. 26-32.

Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light: and what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the housetops. And be not afraid of them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows. Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.

Against the
fear of Man.

sanctuary: yea, I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation. Woe unto you lawyers! for ye took away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered.

And when he was come out from thence, the scribes and the Pharisees began to press upon him vehemently, and to provoke him to speak of many things; laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth.

xii. 1-59.

In the mean time, when the many thousands of the multitude were gathered together, insomuch that they trode one upon another, he began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. But there is nothing covered up, that shall not be revealed: and hid, that shall not be known. Wherefore whatsoever ye have said in the darkness shall be heard in the light; and what ye have spoken in the ear in the inner chambers shall be proclaimed upon the housetops. And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them which kill the body, and after that they have no more that they can do. But I will warn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him. Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? and not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not: ye are of more value than many sparrows. And I say unto you, Everyone who shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God; but he that denieth me in the presence of men shall be denied in the presence of

xii. 32.

And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.

x. 19, 20.

But when they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.

vi. 25-33.

Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment? Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather

the angels of God. And every one who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Spirit it shall not be forgiven. And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious how or what ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say.

And one out of the multitude said unto him, Master, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me. But he said unto him, Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you? And he said unto them, Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things he possesseth. And he spake a parable unto them, saying, The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he reasoned within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have not where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my corn and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry. But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.

And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for *your* life, what ye shall eat; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. For the life is more than the food, and the body than the raiment. Consider the ravens, that they sow not, neither reap; which have no store-

Our Lord's refusal to make himself a Judge.

The Parable of the Rich Fool.

Warnings against Anxiety.

into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they? And which of you by being anxious can add one cubit unto his stature? And why are ye anxious concerning raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith? Be not therefore anxious, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

vi. 20, 21.

Treasure in
Heaven.

Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal: for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also.

xxiv. 42-48.

The Parable
of Waiting
Servants.

Watch therefore: for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh. But know this, that if the master of the house had known in what watch the thief was coming, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken through. Therefore be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh. Who then is the faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath set

chamber nor barn; and God feedeth them: of how much more value are ye than the birds! And which of you by being anxious can add a cubit unto his stature? If then ye are not able to do even that which is least, why are ye anxious concerning the rest? Consider the lilies, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, Even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass in the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven; how much more *shall he* *clothe* you, O ye of little faith? And seek not ye what ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: but your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. Howbeit seek ye his kingdom, and these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell that ye have, and give alms; make for yourselves purses which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief draweth near, neither moth destroyeth. For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.

Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning; and be ye yourselves like unto men looking for their lord, when he shall return from the marriage feast; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may straightway open unto him. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them sit down to meat, and shall

over his household, to give them their food in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that he will set him over all that he hath.

xxiv. 48-51.

But if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My lord tarrieth; and shall begin to beat his fellow-servants, and shall eat and drink with the drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the hypocrites: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth.

x. 34-36.

Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance

come and serve them. And if he shall come in the second watch, and if in the third, and find *them* so, blessed are those *servants*. But know this, that if the master of the house had known in what hour the thief was coming, he would have watched, and not have left his house to be broken through. Be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh.

And Peter said, Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even unto all? And the Lord said, Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall set over his household, to give them their portion of food in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will set him over all that he hath. But if that servant shall say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he expecteth not, and in an hour when he knoweth not, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the unfaithful. And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many *stripes*; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few *stripes*. And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more.

St. Peter's
Question.

I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I, if it is already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished! Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: for there shall be from

The Coming
of the Saviour
causing Strife.

against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law: and a man's foes *shall be* they of his own household.

xvi. 2-3.

Signs of the Times.

But he answered and said unto them, When it is evening, ye say, *It will be fair weather*: for the heaven is red. And in the morning, *It will be foul weather* to-day: for the heaven is red and lowring. Ye know how to discern the face of the heaven; but ye cannot *discern* the signs of the times.

v. 25-26.

The Adversary in the Court.

Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art with him in the way; lest haply the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou have paid the last farthing.

henceforth five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three. They shall be divided, father against son, and son against father; mother against daughter, and daughter against her mother; mother in law against her daughter in law, and daughter in law against her mother in law.

And he said to the multitudes also, When ye see a cloud rising in the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it cometh to pass. And when ye see a south wind blowing, ye say, There will be a scorching heat; and it cometh to pass. Ye hypocrites; ye know how to interpret the face of the earth and the heaven; but how is it that ye know not how to interpret this time? And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? For as thou art going with thine adversary before the magistrate, on the way give diligence to be quit of him; lest haply he hale thee unto the judge, and the judge shall deliver thee to the officer, and the officer shall cast thee into prison. I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou have paid the very last mite.

xiii. 1-35.

The Slaughtered Galileans.

Now there were some present at that very season which told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And he answered and said unto them, Think ye that these Gallileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them, think ye that they were offenders above all the men that dwell in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.

And he spake this parable; A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came seeking fruit thereon, and found none. And he said unto the vine-dresser, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree, and find none: cut it down; why doth it also cumber the ground? And he answering saith unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it: and if it bear fruit thenceforth, *well*; but if not, thou shalt cut it down.

The Barren
Fig Tree.

And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath day. And behold, a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years; and she was bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up. And when Jesus saw her, he called her, and said to her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands upon her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue, being moved with indignation because Jesus had healed on the sabbath, answered and said to the multitude, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the day of the sabbath. But the Lord answered him, and said, Ye hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, *these* eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the sabbath? And as he said these things, all his adversaries were put to shame: and all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.

The Woman
with a Spirit
of Infirmity.

xiii. 31.

Another parable set he before them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took,

He said therefore, Unto what is the kingdom of God like? and whereunto shall I liken it? It is like unto a grain of mustard seed,

The Parables
of the Mustard
Seed and the
Leaven.

and sowed in his field : which indeed is less than all seeds ; but when it is grown , it is greater than the herbs , and becometh a tree , so that the birds of the heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof.

xiii. 33.

Another parable spake he unto them ; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven , which a woman took , and hid in three measures of meal , till it was all leavened.

Journeying to
Jerusalem.

vii. 13-14.

The Narrow
Door.

Enter ye in by the narrow gate : for wide is the gate , and broad is the way , that leadeth to destruction , and many be they that enter in thereby . For narrow is the gate , and straitened the way , that leadeth unto life , and few be they that find it.

xxv. 11-12.

Lord , Lord , open to us . But he answered and said , Verily I say unto you , I know you not . Watch therefore , for ye know not the day nor the hour .

vii. 22-23.

Many will say to me in that day , Lord , Lord , did we not prophesy by thy name , and by thy name cast out devils , and by thy name do many mighty works ? And then will I profess unto them , I never knew you : depart from me , ye that work iniquity .

viii. 11-12.

And I say unto you , that many shall come from the east and the west , and shall sit down with Abraham , and Isaac , and Jacob , in the kingdom of heaven : but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness : there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth . But many shall be last *that are first* ; and first *that are last* .

which a man took , and cast into his own garden ; and it grew , and became a tree ; and the birds of the heaven lodged in the branches thereof . And again he said , Whereunto shall I liken the kingdom of God ? It is like unto leaven , which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal , till it was all leavened .

And he went on his way through cities and villages , teaching , and journeying on unto Jerusalem . And one said unto him , Lord , are they few that be saved ? And he said unto them , Strive to enter in by the narrow door : for many , I say unto you , shall seek to enter in , and shall not be able . When once the master of the house is risen up , and hath shut to the door , and ye begin to stand without , and to knock at the door , saying , Lord , open to us ; and he shall answer and say to you , I know you not whence ye are ; then shall ye begin to say , We did eat and drink in thy presence , and thou didst teach in our streets ; and he shall say , I tell you , I know not whence ye are ; depart from me , all ye workers of iniquity . There shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth , when ye shall see Abraham , and Isaac , and Jacob , and all the prophets , in the kingdom of God , and yourselves cast forth without . And they shall come from the east and west , and from the north and south , and shall sit down in the kingdom of God . And behold , there are last which shall be first , and there are first which shall be last .

The Message
of Herod.

In that very hour there came certain Pharisees , saying to him , Get thee out , and go hence : for Herod would fain kill thee . And he said unto them , Go , and say to that fox , Behold , I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow , and the third *day*

xxiii. 37.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the *day* following: for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen *gathereth* her own brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you *desolate*: and I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.

Woe on
Jerusalem.

xiv. 1-35.

And it came to pass, when he went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on a sabbath to eat bread, that they were watching him. And behold, there was before him a certain man which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath, or not? But they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go. And he said unto them, Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a well, and will not straightway draw him up on a sabbath day? And they could not answer again unto these things.

Meal in a
Pharisee's
House.

The Dropsy
Healed.

And he spake a parable unto those which were bidden, when he marked how they chose out the chief seats; saying unto them, When thou art bidden of any man to a marriage feast, sit not down in the chief seat; lest haply a more honourable man than thou be bidden of him, and he that bade thee and him shall come and say to thee, Give this man place; and then thou shalt begin with shame to take the lowest place. But when thou art bidden, go and sit down in the lowest place; that when he that hath bidden thee cometh, he may say

The Parable
of the Lowest
Place.

xxiii. 12.

And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted.

Whom to
invite to a
Feast.

xxii. 1-10.

The Parable
of the Great
Supper.

And Jesus answered and spake again in parables unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a certain king, which made a marriage feast for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the marriage feast: and they would not come. Again he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them that are bidden, Behold, I have made ready my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come to the marriage feast. But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his own farm, another to his merchandise: and the rest laid hold on his servants, and entreated them shamefully, and killed them. But the king was wroth; and he sent his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned their city. Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they that were bidden were not worthy. Go ye therefore unto the partings of the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage feast. And those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found,

to thee, Friend, go up higher: then shalt thou have glory in the presence of all that sit at meat with thee. For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

And he said to him also that had bidden him, When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest haply they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; because they have not *wherewith* to recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just.

And when one of them that sat at meat with him heard these things, he said unto him, Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God. But he said unto him, A certain man made a great supper; and he bade many: and he sent forth his servant at supper time to say to them that were bidden, Come; for *all* things are now ready. And they all with one *consent* began to make excuse. The first said unto him, I have bought a field, and I must needs go out and see it: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come. And the servant came, and told his lord these things. Then the master of the house being angry said to his servant, Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor and maimed and blind and lame. And the servant said, Lord, what thou didst command is done, and yet there is room. And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways

both bad and good: and the wedding was filled with guests.

x. 37, 38.

He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that doth not take his cross and follow after me, is not worthy of me.

and hedges, and constrain *them* to come in, that my house may be filled. For I say unto you, that none of those men which were bidden shall taste of my supper.

Now there went with him great multitudes: and he turned, and said unto them, If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. Whosoever doth not bear his own cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. For which of you, desiring to build a tower, doth not first sit down and count the cost, whether he have *wherewith* to complete it? Lest haply, when he hath laid a foundation, and is not able to finish, all that behold begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish. Or what king, as he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and asketh conditions of peace. So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple. Salt therefore is good: but if even the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? It is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill: *men* cast it out. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

The cost of true Discipleship.

v. 13.

Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men.

Savourless Salt.

xiii. 9.

He that hath ears, let him hear.

xv. 1-32.

Now all the publicans and sinners were drawing near unto him for to hear him. And both the Pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.

The Murmuring of Pharisees.

xviii. 12-14.

How think ye? if any man have a hundred sheep, and one of

And he spake unto them this parable, saying, What man of you,

The Lost Sheep.

them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and go unto the mountains, and seek that which goeth astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, herejoiceth over it more than over the ninety and nine which have not gone astray. Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.

The Lost Piece
of Silver.

having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and his neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, *more* than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance.

Or what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a lamp, and sweep the house, and seek diligently until she find it? And when she hath found it, she calleth together her friends and neighbours, saying, Rejoice with me, for I have found the piece which I had lost. Even so, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

The Prodigal
Son.

And he said, A certain man had two sons: and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion of *thy* substance that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country; and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country; and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he would fain have been filled with the husks that the swine did eat: and no man gave unto him. But when he came to himself he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish here with hunger!

I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son: make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. But while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: and bring the fatted calf, *and* kill it, and let us eat, and make merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found. And they began to be merry. Now his elder son was in the field: and as he came and drew nigh to the house, he heard music and dancing. And he called to him one of the servants, and inquired what these things might be. And he said unto him, Thy brother is come; and thy father hath killed the fatted calf, because he hath received him safe and sound. But he was angry, and would not go in: and his father came out, and intreated him. But he answered and said to his father, Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine: and *yet* thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: but when this thy son came, which hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou killedst for him the fatted calf. And he said unto him, Son, thou art ever with me, and all that is mine is thine. But it was meet to make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive *again*; and *was* lost, and is found.

The Unjust
Steward.

xvi. 1-31.

And he said also unto the disciples, There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he was wasting his goods. And he called him, and said unto him, What is this that I hear of thee? render the account of thy stewardship; for thou canst be no longer steward. And the steward said within himself, What shall I do, seeing that my lord taketh away the stewardship from me? I have not strength to dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses. And calling to him each one of his lord's debtors, he said to the first, How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, A hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bond, and sit down quickly and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said a hundred measures of wheat. He saith unto him, Take thy bond, and write fourscore. And his lord commended the unrighteous steward because he had done wisely: for the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles. He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true *riches*? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other;

The Mammon
of Unrighteousness.

vi. 24.

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he

will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

xi, 12, 13.

And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.

v. 18.

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished.

xix. 9.

And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.

or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

And the Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all these things; and they scoffed at him. And he said unto them, Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God. The law and the prophets *were* until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it. But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall. Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery.

The Gospel
and the Law.

The Teaching
on Adultery.

Now there was a certain rich man, and he was clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day: and a certain beggar named Lazarus was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the *crumbs* that fell from the rich man's table; yea, even the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and that he was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom: and the rich man also died, and was buried. And in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am in anguish in this flame. But Abraham said,

Dives and
Lazarus.

Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things: but now here he is comforted, and thou art in anguish. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, that they which would pass from hence to you may not be able, and that none may cross over from thence to us. And he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. But Abraham saith, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead.

Offences.

xviii. 5-7.

And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me: but whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on me to stumble, it is profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and *that* he should be sunk in the depth of the sea.

Forgiveness.

Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling! for it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!

xviii. 15.

And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.

xviii. 21-22.

Then came Peter, and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times?

xvii. 1-37.

And he said unto his disciples, It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come: but woe unto him, through whom they come! It were well for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble. Take heed to yourselves: if thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him.

Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven.

xvii. 20.

For verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.

xxi. 21.

Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do what is done to the fig tree, but even if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea, it shall be done.

And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith. And the Lord said, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed you. But who is there of you, having a servant plowing or keeping sheep, that will say unto him, when he is come in from the field, Come straightway and sit down to meat; and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink? Doth he thank the servant because he did the things that were commanded? Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do.

Increase of Faith.

Unprofitable Servant.

And it came to pass, as they were on the way to Jerusalem, that he was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee. And as he entered into a certain village, there met him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: and they lifted up their voices, saying, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. And when he saw them, he said unto them, Go and shew yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, as they went, they were cleansed. And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, with a loud voice glorifying God; and he fell upon his face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan. And Jesus answering said, Were not the ten cleansed? but where are the nine? Were there none found that returned to give glory to God, save this

The Ten Lepers.

The Coming of
the Kingdom.

xxiv. 23-27.

Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the Christ, or, Here; believe *it* not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. Behold, I have told you beforehand. If therefore they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the wilderness; go not forth: Behold, he is in the inner chambers; believe *it* not. For as the lightning cometh forth from the east, and is seen even unto the west; so shall be the coming of the Son of man.

xxiv. 37-39.

And as *were* the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of man. For as in those days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall be the coming of the Son of man.

xxiv. 17, 18.

Let him that is on the housetop not go down to take out the things that are in his house: and let him that is in the field not return back to take his cloke.

x. 39.

He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it.

xvi. 25.

For whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever

stranger? And he said unto him, Arise, and go thy way: thy faith hath made thee whole.

And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you.

And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. And they shall say to you, Lo, there! Lo, here! go not away, nor follow after *them*: for as the lightning, when it lighteneth out of the one part under the heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall the Son of man be in his day. But first must he suffer many things and be rejected of this generation. And as it came to pass in the days of Noah, even so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise even as it came to pass in the days of Lot; they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but in the day that Lot went out from Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all: after the same manner shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed. In that day, he which shall be on the housetop, and his goods in the house, let him not go down to take them away: and let him that is in the field likewise not return back. Remember Lot's wife. Whosoever shall seek to gain his life shall lose it: but whosoever shall lose *his life* shall preserve it.

shall lose his life for my sake shall find it.

xxiv. 40, 41.

Then shall two men be in the field; one is taken, and one is left: two women *shall be* grinding at the mill; one is taken, and one is left.

xxiv. 28.

Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

I say unto you, In that night there shall be two men on one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. There shall be two women grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left. And they answering say unto him, Where, Lord? And he said unto them, Where the body *is*, thither will the eagles also be gathered together.

xviii. 1-14.

And he spake a parable unto them to the end that they ought always to pray, and not to faint; saying, There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, and regarded not man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came oft unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest she wear me out by her continual coming. And the Lord said, Hear what the unrighteous judge saith. And shall not God avenge his elect, which cry to him day and night, and he is longsuffering over them? I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily. Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

The Unjust Judge.

And he spake also this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and set all others at nought: Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week; I give tithes

The Pharisee and Publican.

xxiii. 12.

And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted.

of all that I get. But the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote his breast, saying, God, be merciful to me a sinner. I say unto you, This man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; but he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

Similar sayings repeated even in the same gospel.

The Sign of Jonas.
The True Greatness.
The Lamp and Stand.

Argument from the nature of our Lord's ministry.

It is clear from this list that one or both of the gospels must be thoroughly irregular, if those discourses which resemble each other are the same. This alone, after the evidence already adduced, is a strong presumption for their real diversity. But we have also many instances in the same gospel, of sayings repeated by our Lord at different times, almost in the very same words, as Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4, Mark ix. 36, 37, x. 14, Luke viii. 16, xi. 33.

A further presumption may be drawn from the nature of our Lord's ministry. It lasted three years, and was carried on in hundreds of places throughout Palestine, before assemblies of hearers who were changing from day to day. Hence it is morally certain that many of his discourses would be often repeated, though in each instance there might be partial variations, to suit the varying circumstances of each audience. If the whole of our Lord's sayings had been recorded, it would certainly have been a hundred times longer than what is now left us in the four gospels. Hence the mere resemblance of two passages, without further evidence, can be no proof that the discourse is actually the same. Yet it must be probable that any discourse or saying would be varied in the repetition, and abstract reasons alone will hardly teach us the usual extent of such variation.

Reasons why St. Luke should record those sayings that recurred again.

In the present case, St. Luke, who professes to write an account in order, has included the whole within a period of our Saviour's ministry, which is entirely omitted in the two other gospels. Now it is morally certain that, in the last six months before his death, our Lord would repeat many things, which he had spoken earlier in his ministry.

The only reasonable doubt will be, whether St. Luke, if he knew the other gospel, would have included in his own selection so much that was already recorded by St. Matthew at an earlier date. There is, however, a most weighty reason why this course should have been preferred. While the character of the third gospel, as an addition to the evangelical history, rendered it desirable to insert many fresh facts and discourses, the object of confirming the greater part of the record by two witnesses would be best secured, by selecting many which were the same, in substance, with others recorded by St. Matthew. There would thus be a substantial confirmation of the message by two writers; while fuller light would be derived from the mention of two distinct events, where the same truths are presented, according to the varying circumstances of the hearers, in new combinations.

Again, some of the passages which most nearly resemble each other, have notes of time, in each gospel, which forbid us to confound them together, and a relation to their context, in each instance, which forbids their dislocation. The prayer for labourers is exactly the same in the mission of the Twelve Apostles in St. Matthew, and of the Seventy Disciples in St. Luke. The words "Blessed are your eyes," etc., in St. Matthew, are closely linked with the Parable of the Sower, and in St. Luke with the return of the Seventy, events more than a year apart, and are so appropriate in both cases, as to vindicate the truth of their position in each gospel. The woes on the Pharisees appear in St. Matthew on the last day of our Lord's public ministry; but in St. Luke, during a private dinner in a Pharisee's house, somewhere in the dominions of Herod. A passage of some length, resembling part of the Sermon on the Mount, follows the same day (St. Luke xii. 1). Again, chap. xiii., in Herod's dominions, ends with the same warning to Jerusalem, which in St. Matthew is the appropriate and emphatic close of our Lord's public ministry. In all these cases the words are nearly the same, and still the occasions on which they were uttered are clearly different. It is a natural inference that the same remark still applies, even

Their adaptation to their context in each case.

Three test cases.

(1) The Caution to the Disciples.

where the evidence is less decisive, since the order of St. Luke's gospel, in all the instances alike, requires the separation. Let us examine a few of these parallel passages, which have been usually confounded together.

(1) THE CAUTION TO DISCIPLES, Matt. viii. 18-22, Luke ix. 57-62.

The verbal resemblance between these passages is very great, and still there are many marks that the occasions were quite different. The voyage to Gadara is given by St. Luke, with a plain reference to the account in St. Matthew. If the events were the same, and took place at that time, there is no reason why St. Luke should not have retained the true order, which he found in St. Matthew. Two disciples are addressed in one case, three in the other. Two of them, in St. Luke, have the charge to go and preach the gospel; no such charge is mentioned by St. Matthew. And this agrees with the context, since one event was earlier than the first Mission of the Twelve, while the other is placed just before the Mission of the Seventy. The self-denial, in one case, was in the stormy voyage to the desert side of the lake; in the other, it lay clearly in the summons to take part in a public ministry, of much odium and some real danger. One party, in St. Matthew, was a scribe, but no such peculiar character is given to the first applicant in St. Luke's gospel.

(2) The Lord's Prayer.

(2) THE LORD'S PRAYER, Matt. vi. 9-13, Luke xi. 1-4.

It has been usual, with recent critics, to maintain that this prayer was only once given; and the greater number, as Schleiermacher, Sieffert, Olshausen, and Neander, and more recently Da Costa, imagine that St. Luke alone has given it in its true place. It is certainly there placed in a very natural and appropriate connection; while the short parable that follows unites it closely with the general command and promise in verses 9-13 of the same chapter. But then the connection in St. Matthew is not less appropriate. Three practical subjects are there treated in succession,—alms, prayer, and fasting. Under the first and last a warning is given against hypocrisy; under the

second, a further caution against vain repetitions, to avoid which this brief pattern is set before them. It is followed, not as in St. Luke, by a direct encouragement to prayer, but by a statement to justify the peculiar form of the petition for forgiveness. One connection is just as suited to the public instructions of a Lawgiver, as the other to the private admonitions of a most loving Saviour and Friend. That this prayer should be repeated once more, after an interval of more than two years, cannot surely have the shadow of difficulty with any reasonable mind.¹ Besides, the occasion of the request in St. Luke makes it highly probable that the disciples both desired and expected a much longer formulary. Our Saviour, by repeating simply the brief prayer he had already given, as well as by the parable and the promise, recalls their thoughts from the tendency to mere formalism, and reminds them that earnestness and faith were the grand requisites to be kept in view. It was indeed very fitting that those words, so precious to the whole Church through long ages, should be uttered once near the beginning, and once again, near the close of our Saviour's ministry.

(3) THE DISCOURSE ON BLASPHEMY, Matt. xii. 22-45, Luke xi. 14-36. (3) The Discourse on Blasphemy.

These two passages, from their great resemblance, are held by most harmonists to refer to the same event. But besides the utter dislocation of St. Luke's narrative which this view requires, there are other reasons which seem to be decisive against it.

The order appears thus in St. Matthew. First, one who was possessed, blind and dumb, is brought to Jesus, and healed. The Pharisees, upon this, charge him with casting out devils by Beelzebub. He defends himself from the charge, and warns them of the fearful guilt of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. They next ask him for a sign, and he answers them by an allusion to Jonah and the Queen of Sheba, and closes by the parable of the unclean

¹ In the one case it is given as a *model*, and in the other as a *form* of prayer. Whether the Revisers were right in their abbreviations in St. Luke is open to grave doubt.—Ed.

spirit, and the solemn threatening, "Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation."

The order is different in St. Luke. First, Jesus casts out a devil from one "possessed and dumb," and the people wonder at the cure. Some of the crowd then charge him with casting out devils by Beelzebub, and others demand a sign. He defends himself from that charge, and adds the parable of the unclean spirit. A woman from the crowd praises him, and he briefly replies. The multitudes crowd together, and he then replies to the demand for a sign, and closes by another parable, of the lighted candle, with a final caution and encouragement. While he yet spake, we are told in one case, that his mother and brethren came to call him, and in the other, that a Pharisee asked him to dine, and our Lord instantly complied with the request.

The occurrence, in the two first gospels, has its place clearly fixed; since the parable of the Sower, as each of them states, followed on the same day. Now St. Luke has given the same parable, and after the many proofs that he was acquainted with the two other gospels, it must be highly improbable, if the event were the same, that he should thus have torn it away entirely from its true historical connection. But there are other differences beside. The demoniac in St. Matthew was both blind and dumb. The peculiarity of the miracle lay in the triple cure at the same moment. Even in the very same gospel, another cure is mentioned, "of a dumb man possessed with a devil," Matt. ix. 32-34; and it is added that, "when the devil was cast out, the dumb spake, and the people wondered"; but the Pharisees said, "He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils." Again, we learn from St. Mark, that the child, who was healed after the Transfiguration, "had a dumb spirit." Hence we have repeated instances of dumbness being healed along with dispossession, but only one in which blindness was cured at the same time. This peculiar combination seems to have been one reason why St. Matthew records the cure at length, with the discourse that immediately followed. But the

cure in St. Luke was one of dumbness alone, with possession; for if blindness had been cured at the same time, this would have been more remarkable than the other part of the cure, and would not have been omitted. There can be no doubt, from comparing the three gospels, that cases of the dispossession of a dumb spirit were very numerous. If the present one is distinct, four will have been actually specified, two in St. Matthew ix. 32-34, xii. 22-24, one in St. Mark ix. 17, and one here in St. Luke also.

Again, the wonder of the people, and the charge of casting out devils by Beelzebub, were events which frequently occurred. They are mentioned by St. Matthew as clearly in the instance where no discourse is recorded, as in the dispossession of the blind and dumb. The surprise at our Lord's miracles is of perpetual recurrence, and the accusation against him, or one closely akin to it, is alluded to in the Commission of the Twelve, Matt. x. 25, as one standing feature of our Lord's ministry. The demand for a sign is also frequent, being mentioned twice by St. Matthew, and twice, on distinct occasions, by St. John (St. John ii. 18, vi. 30), besides this passage, and it is referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. i. 22) as the characteristic temptation of the Jewish people. Hence the occurrence of a dispossession during the last journey, along with such a demand for a sign, cannot involve the slightest improbability.

The order of the two discourses is clearly different, and in neither case is a transposition possible without violence. In St. Matthew the charge of a conspiracy with Satan is first made and answered, then the demand for a sign is made by the Scribes and Pharisees and repelled in its turn, while the parable of the unclean spirit, and the consequent warning, terminate the whole. In St. Luke the charge and the demand are first made together, and the charge is repelled, with the parable of the unclean spirit at the close. The exclamation of the woman is then interposed, and presently, the people gathering more thickly together, the demand for a sign is answered, and the reply closed by a new parable, enforcing the need of spiritual discernment. Thus the passage in St. Matthew

ends with a stern denunciation, but the one in St. Luke with an affectionate warning, and a cheering encouragement to those by whom the warning should be obeyed. If the events were the same, and St. Matthew has given rightly the order of the demand for a sign, then the transposition in St. Luke, of the verses xi. 24-26, from their natural place at the close, appears unaccountable. And if the demand for a sign took place before the discourse began, the words of St. Matthew, "Then answered some of the Scribes and Pharisees, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee," are equally unnatural, and would convey an erroneous impression of the motive which prompted them.

On the other hand, it is not in the least unlikely that when the same charge was made, and the same demand repeated by distinct parties, and on different occasions, our Lord would meet it again and again with nearly the same answer, though varied in each case according to his insight into the character and motives of those whom he addressed. If the actual resemblance between two such discourses were great, it would perhaps become still greater, when the second of them was reported by one who knew familiarly the record of the other, already given by an apostle and eye-witness. Instead of freely resorting to a peculiar version of his own, he might probably content himself with introducing only such changes as were essential features of the later discourse, so that some specific cause might be discovered for each of them by a careful observer.

Again, the discourse in St. Luke is there linked inseparably with the meal in the Pharisee's house. Now the denunciations of woe, then uttered, are precisely similar to those in Matt. xxiii. A discourse which followed the same day exactly answers, in two of its parts, to the Sermon on the Mount, and to the close of the Prophecy on Mount Olivet. Hence, if resemblance proves identity, the series in St. Luke will be referred in St. Matthew to four different points of time; one at the beginning, one near the middle, and two at the very close of our Lord's ministry. Lastly,

while the discourse on blasphemy in St. Matthew was followed by the first public teaching in parables, that in St. Luke is itself connected with three parables, and with a clear intimation (xii. 41) that this mode of teaching was now quite familiar to the disciples. On all these accounts, the events must have been distinct. And since this is the case where the verbal resemblance is perhaps the most extensive and complete, the same conclusion may be extended to other passages in which the same feature appears.

The comparison of these parallel sayings, now that they are shown to be really distinct, will further evince the later composition of the third gospel. In six or seven instances St. Luke will thus be seen to have omitted sayings of our Lord on their first occurrence, though he gives the event which occasioned them, and to have reserved them for a later time, when they were repeated once more. The mention of the harvest and the labourers (x. 2), the woe on the Galilean cities (x. 13), and its attendant thanksgiving (x. 21), the declaration of the disciples' blessedness in seeing the works of Christ (x. 23), the discourse on Blasphemy (xi. 14), the warning against hypocrisy (xii. 1), the rebuke on those who neglect the signs of the times (xii. 56), the parables of the Leaven and Mustard-seed (xiii. 18), the woe on those who cause offences (xvii. 1), are all examples of this usage. If St. Luke wrote after the two others, this circumstance may be very simply explained. He omits these particulars in his earlier chapters, because he purposed to introduce them on their later recurrence, in the original portion of his own narrative. The solution applies even to those cases where the order is the reverse. These relate exclusively to some parts of the discourses in Passion Week, a full record of which was essential in every gospel. Hence in the case of duplicate events, one in Passion Week, and the other in the course of the general ministry, it is the later which would be likely to be first recorded. Two such instances are the anointing at Bethany compared with Luke vii. 36-50, and the denunciations in Matt. xxiii. compared with Luke xi., xiii.

Sayings
omitted by
Luke on first
occurrence to
be inserted
afterwards.

In one passage this peculiar relation of the two histories may be seen very clearly. The accounts of the Baptist's message, Matt. xi. 2-19, Luke vii. 19-23, have a minute verbal correspondence. Three passages, however, of that chapter are omitted by St. Luke, and appear, with little or no change, in this later portion of his gospel.

ST. MATTHEW xi. 12-14.

And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.

xi. 21-23.

Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Howbeit I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgement, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt go down unto Hades: for if the mighty works had been done in Sodom which were done in thee, it would have remained until this day.

xi. 25-28.

At that season Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*.

ST. LUKE xvi. 16.

The law and the prophets *were* until John: from that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it,

x. 13-15.

Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which were done in you, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. Howbeit it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the judgement, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt be brought down unto Hades.

x. 21, 22.

In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father; for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*.

The passage Matt. xi. 2-11, 16-19, is found in Luke vii. 19-35, with scarcely a verbal change, and with its histo-

rical place clearly defined. The three portions, however, which intervene and follow, xi. 12, 13, 20-23, 25-27, are omitted there, and appear with little change, on two distinct occasions near the close of our Lord's ministry, Luke xvi. 16, x. 13-15, 21-22. Yet the whole discourse in St. Matthew is linked together by a natural connection. We may therefore conclude St. Luke has made use of the earlier record, but has purposely omitted sayings that were afterwards repeated, to record them in their place at a later period of the history.

The title of our Lord in these chapters, Luke ix. 51-xviii. 14, when compared with the two other gospels, is a clear sign of a later composition. In St. Matthew, the name Jesus is always used when the writer speaks in his own person. In St. Mark the same rule is observed, except in the last verse alone. The same is true of the earlier part of the third gospel, where it runs parallel with the others, though here there are two or three exceptions. The first is in the healing of the Paralytic, Luke v. 17, "And the power of the Lord was present to heal them." The second, in the raising of the widow's son, vii. 13, "And when the Lord saw her he had compassion on her." The third, which is more doubtful, since the clause is rejected by Griesbach and Scholz, occurs in the same chapter: "And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation?" (v. 31). It may also be observed that the first exception appears where a fresh detail is introduced, and the second, in the narrative of an event which is not found in the two other gospels.

The title
"Lord,"
applied to
Jesus, a mark
of later date.

When we pass on, however, to the latter part of the gospel, and especially to this middle portion, where it stands alone, there is a remarkable variation of style. The title, Lord, is substituted thirteen times for the simple and purely historical name, Jesus. Of these instances no less than eight are found in the report of the last journeys peculiar to St. Luke; while of the five others, three occur in the narrative of events which are found in this gospel alone.

The substitution, in the Church of Christ, of this title of

reverence for the historical name Jesus, would plainly be gradual, and would probably be more rapid in their case who had never seen their Lord in the flesh, while it must have been completely established, as we infer from the Epistles of St. Paul, in the course of one generation. Hence the contrast in this respect is a clear sign that St. Luke wrote later than the two others; or else that his gospel, while later than St. Matthew's, was, less than that of St. Mark, moulded by the information of a present eye-witness. And since, even in those chapters where the title of honour is most largely used, the name Jesus occurs three times as often, this will be a further presumption that the absolute date lay within the limits of the first generation.

Its rare use in
St. John ex-
plainable.

It may seem at first to interfere with this argument, that St. John, whom all allow to have written later than St. Luke, uses the name 250 times, and the title only seventeen times in his whole gospel. But one simple remark will remove the difficulty which this fact might seem to create. St. John was himself an eye-witness, and the most intimate personal companion of our Lord in the days of his flesh. His language, therefore, whenever he wrote, would be moulded by the vividness of his own personal recollections, and also by a constant recollection of the express object of his work, which was to bear witness that Jesus was the Christ. And hence the very fact of the title being introduced seven times, which appears only twice in St. Mark, and seven times in St. Luke, excluding this middle and peculiar portion, agrees well with the later date of the fourth gospel, when due allowance has been made for the difference between a younger convert and the beloved apostle of the Lord.

St. Luke
gained infor-
mation from
the Seventy.

It may be observed that the part of the gospel where this frequent use of the title appears, commences with the mission of the Seventy Disciples, and closes xviii. 14, where the narrative reunites itself to those of St. Mark and St. Matthew. Now it seems highly probable that, during most of the incidents thus recorded, not only the Twelve Apostles, but the greater part of the Seventy Disciples, would be pre-

sent. The Evangelist might therefore have access to many believers who could recount the incidents and discourses of these last months of our Lord's ministry, though they had not been present through its whole course; while the same circumstance would render it less needful that these incidents should be recorded early, from the greater number of surviving witnesses.

NOTE.

My father's remarks upon this middle portion of St. Luke's gospel would seem to me to have acquired fresh importance in face of some more recent statements.

It might be maintained—and indeed it seems to be the view of Professor Salmon—that the very scattered way in which the sayings of the Sermon on the Mount appear recorded in the gospel of St. Luke, is in itself an indication that Matthew and Luke wrote independently, without a knowledge of one another's gospels, “and therefore,” adds Professor Salmon, “it is likely that they wrote almost at the same time; for otherwise, had any interval of years divided them, the one would probably have seen the gospel of the other.”

“Of the 107 verses in the Sermon on the Mount, only 27 occur in the corresponding discourse in Luke vi. ;

12 more are found in the 11th chapter,

14 more are found in the 12th chapter,

3 more are found in the 13th chapter,

1 more is found in the 14th chapter,

3 more are found in the 16th chapter,

and 47 are omitted altogether.”

From this he concludes that the sayings they have in common “must have reached them as independent fragments of an oral tradition,” and he is led to a more general argument in favour of the thorough independence of Matthew and Luke, whatever may be the relations of Mark to the other two, and after comparing in detail the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke, he sums up this argument thus: “As we proceed further in our comparison of the two gospels, we continue to find a number of things

in each which are not recorded in the other ; and it is not easy to see why, if one were using the other as an authority, he should omit so many things well-suited to his purpose. When, therefore, we have to explain the agreements of these two evangelists, the hypothesis that one borrowed directly from the other is so immensely less probable than the hypothesis that both writers drew from a common source, that the former hypothesis may safely be left out of consideration." (Professor Salmon's "Introduction," p. 140.)

It is with great diffidence that I venture to impugn the argument of a man of so great mathematical pre-eminence as Dr. Salmon. His seeming solution of the perplexing problem is captivating in its great simplicity, and the reasoning has the attractiveness of a short cut to a conclusive finding ; and yet, it seems to me, that when we follow it more closely, it only leads, as short cuts often do, to certain disappointment.

We are not sufficiently informed of the purpose of Luke when he wrote ; of the scale on which he planned his work ; of the amount of information already in possession of Theophilus, for whom he wrote ; of the amount of matter apparently well-suited to his purpose then current in tradition, although it has not found a place in any of our gospels, to be fair judges of what he chose to omit. We may see the finished result, brought about by the teaching of God the Holy Ghost, we may trace its adaptation to the need of every after age, but we do not know enough about the process of its composition to enable us to argue that the omission by the writer of one gospel of a circumstance recorded in another is any weighty proof of their entire independence. The arguments for their mutual dependence, so far as they do carry us, are positive, and though regarded singly they may be of very various value, still they are far too numerous to be of merely chance occurrence. This argument for independence is purely negative.

Suppose, for instance—and the supposition appears to me in no way inconsistent with the words of Luke's preface—that Theophilus already had the gospel of Matthew, and that he also had a number of less trustworthy narratives that were

beginning to confuse his mind; suppose also that Luke had seen some or all of these: two courses would be open to him. He might say, Matthew says so and so, your other writers this; they may be reconciled thus, or the imperfect writer has gone astray at such a point. A document like this, had Luke composed it, however great its literary interest, would have had little value for the after Church, and would have only kept alive the memory of errors that were far better left to die a natural death. Or, on the other hand, he might, as we see that he did, compose a wholly new, continuous relation, with constant reference to these more garbled narratives, but without a single distinct mention of them, after his opening sentence. If this were the case, we could not be in a position to say why he has omitted just this incident and retained just that one, unless we had a knowledge of these other narratives to guide us, and they are wholly gone.

But it may be replied, "The arguments for mutual dependence, so far as they do go, are positive, but are they not outweighed by the perplexities? The theory of common documents will cut the Gordian knot; it will explain the agreements of the gospels as well as our theory of mutual succession can explain them, it will explain the disagreements too in which the theory of mutual succession fails."

To this we answer: First, that the theory of mutual succession rests only upon facts that are known; the theory of common documents is based upon a fiction¹ of the critical imagination. The gospel of Matthew is a fact; it has impressed itself upon the consciousness of each successive generation of mankind: the common documents are but a shifting phantom of the critics' ingenuity, and there is no

¹ That some writings were current before Luke's gospel, is known; but that any such were known both to Matthew and Luke is matter of conjecture, and the contents of any such are purely matter of conjecture: the gospel of Matthew would hardly have been current long without becoming known to Luke. The narrative of some unknown writer, say in Syria, might have been current for years, in a limited circle, without its coming under Matthew's notice.

consensus even of opinion about what was contained in them. Plainly, *cæteris paribus*, that theory should have the preference that least intrudes upon the region of romance—that rests most simply upon facts of which no doubt is possible.

But again, all the arguments for mutual succession are not equally satisfied by any theory of common documents. Many of the arguments of my father's book (and some of them are very strong ones) go to prove that Luke wrote at a date considerably subsequent to Matthew; if this be so, the chances were—Professor Salmon would admit it—that Luke had seen and was familiar with his gospel. The theory of Dr. Salmon assumes the gospels to be nearly contemporaneous; if it can be shown that they were not so, it ceases at once to be so “immensely less probable” that one of them borrowed from the other: is not the balance of the probabilities transferred to the opposite scale?

The main arguments for the total independence of Matthew and Luke are (1) the accounts of the Infancy in the two gospels, and (2) the utter dislocation of the Sermon on the Mount as it appears in Luke.

We may say a word about each.

(1) The concluding chapters of my father's work indicate briefly how the account of the Infancy in each gospel falls in exactly with its main drift and bearing and spiritual purpose. If it can be shown that each has a definite aim in those incidents that he has chosen to record, it rests with others to prove that Matthew was ignorant of what Luke wrote, or, *vice versa*, in the things that they omit; the bare fact of omission can be no proof of it. It has been said that Matthew shows his ignorance of Joseph and Mary's early Galilean origin; and it is true that, unless the word *πάτρις*, applied to Galilee, be taken as a mention, he does not mention it; but surely it is most unlikely that Matthew, an early apostle, and himself an inhabitant of Galilee, would have to wait for Luke, a Gentile, to give him information on the point of Joseph's first abode. If he omits to mention it, it is at least as likely that it never

occurred to him to state expressly a thing so commonly known.

(2) Again, how natural it is that Matthew, who himself had heard it, should set down the Sermon on the Mount in full. With the purpose-like method acquired in his business training he gives at the outset of the ministry a clear, connected statement of the Saviour's doctrine. How natural again that Luke, who followed afterwards, having in his inquiries received, from one or more of the Seventy, particulars about our Lord's last journeyings, should set down just those points, especially of doctrine, that corresponded with the Sermon at the first. He would be more assured himself of the entire accuracy of the reports conveyed to him, where they were thus confirmed by what he knew already of the Saviour's teaching; at the same time he would thus himself best confirm the statements of the earlier evangelist, putting them in fresh lights and new connections, and showing that the teaching of the Saviour was no development of doctrine—not, as with other teachers, a slow approximation to a perfect truth—but homogeneous and complete from first to last, although so various in use and application.

That sayings were repeated, even frequently, will not surprise us more than that a clergyman, having instructed his scholars in the Catechism as a whole, should afterwards in his addresses quote, now from the "Duty to my Neighbour," now from the "Answer on Prayer," and now from the "Baptismal Covenant."—ED.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE RELATIVE DATE OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AS SHOWN BY
THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE. FROM THE BLESSING OF THE
CHILDREN TO THE CLOSE OF THE BOOK.

THE last portion of the gospels to be compared extends from the blessing of the little children to their close, and the ascension of our Lord into heaven. For there is a general agreement in the events which are recorded, and in their arrangement, but several minor variations. From the extent of the previous remarks it will be enough here to select three particulars for comparison: the Request of the Ruler, the Cure of the Blind Man, and the Gifts to the Treasury.

{α) The
Ruler's Ques-
tion.

I. The account of the Ruler's Question occurs thus in the three gospels:—

ST. MATTHEW xix.
16-22.

And behold, one came to him and said, Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good: but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? And Jesus said, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt

ST. MARK x. 17-22.

And as he was going forth into the way, there ran one to him, and kneeled to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, *even* God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not kill, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Do not

ST. LUKE xviii. 18-23.

And a certain ruler asked him, saying, Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? none is good, save one, *even* God. Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Honour thy father and mother. And he said, All these things have I observed from my

not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I observed: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wouldest be perfect, go, sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. But when the young man heard the saying, he went away sorrowful: for he was one that had great possessions.

father and mother. And he said unto him, Master, all these things have I observed from my youth. And Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. But his countenance fell at the saying, and he went away sorrowful: for he was one that had great possessions.

youth up. And when Jesus heard it, he said unto him, One thing thou lackest yet: sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me. But when he heard these things, he became exceeding sorrowful; for he was very rich.

All the three gospels have here a close, and, in some clauses, a verbal agreement, but St. Mark and St. Luke agree more exactly with each other than with St. Matthew.¹ This is apparent in the opening clause—"thou knowest the commandments,"—in the form of the precepts, where *μη* with the conjunctive replaces the future tense of St. Matthew,—in their order, adultery being named before murder,—and in the absence of the precept, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." It appears further in the omission of the inquiry, "What lack I yet?" and the substitution of the answer, "One thing thou lackest;" and thus extends to six minute particulars. It seems almost certain, then, that one has made use of the other's narrative. There are, however, two or three slight changes, which seem to imply that St. Luke has revised the other account. The construction, in the third line, is rendered more classical. In the answer of Jesus a compound verb, *διαδος*, is used, which is more expressive, and the two last

¹ My father followed the old text.

The Revisers further emphasize the difference in St. Matthew by adopting the reading *τι με ἐρώτας περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ*; on the other hand, they make St. Mark agree with St. Matthew in the order of the commandments. In both cases their text is open to much doubt.—ED.

clauses are expressed in a more elegant form. These changes, though slight, all agree with the view that St. Luke wrote after the two other evangelists, and freely combined their statements with his own materials.

NOTE.

(β) The Cure
of the Blind
Men.

II. The second passage which my father selected for comparison in this last section is the Cure of the Blind Men at Jericho. It stands thus in the three gospels:—

ST. MATTHEW XX.
29-34.

And as they went out from Jericho, a great multitude followed him. And behold, two blind men sitting by the way side, when they heard that Jesus was passing by, cried out, saying, Lord, have mercy on us, thou son of David. And the multitude rebuked them, that they should hold their peace: but they cried out the more, saying, Lord, have mercy on us, thou son of David. And Jesus stood still, and called them, and said, What will ye that I should do unto you? They say unto him, Lord, that our eyes may be opened. And Jesus, being moved with compassion, touched their eyes: and straightway they received their sight, and followed him.

ST. MARK X. 46-52.

And they come to Jericho: and as he went out from Jericho, with his disciples and a great multitude, the son of Timæus, Bartimæus, a blind beggar, was sitting by the way side. And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me. And many rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have mercy on me. And Jesus stood still, and said, Call ye him. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good cheer: rise, he calleth thee. And he, casting away his garment, sprang up, and came to Jesus. And Jesus answered him, and said, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? And the blind man said unto him, Rabboni, that I may receive my sight. And Jesus said

ST. LUKE XVIII. 35-43.

And it came to pass, as he drew nigh unto Jericho, a certain blind man sat by the way side begging: and hearing a multitude going by, he inquired what this meant. And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by. And he cried, saying, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me. And they that went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have mercy on me. And Jesus stood, and commanded him to be brought unto him: and when he was come near, he asked him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? And he said, Lord, that I may receive my sight. And Jesus said unto him, Receive thy sight: thy faith hath made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed him, glorifying God:

unto him, Gothy way; and all the people,
 thy faith hath made when they saw it, gave
 thee whole. And praise unto God.
 straightway he re-
 ceived his sight, and
 followed him in the
 way.

My father, following Greswell, proposed to solve the seeming discrepancies of the narrative by the supposition of two miracles, one on the entrance to, and one on the departure from Jericho, the two being briefly combined by Matthew, and separately mentioned by St. Mark and St. Luke. This view has been generally abandoned, I think, by more recent writers, and I have no means of knowing whether my father still held it in his later years. I have thought it better to omit the paragraph. The passage is certainly not one that in itself would favour the hypothesis of mutual succession. It will continue probably to exercise the critics. All one can say with assurance is this, that the points of resemblance between the narratives are almost as striking as the points of difference, and if it is not easily to be explained upon a theory of mutual succession, it is hardly more easily to be explained upon a theory of total independence. No theory yet devised will remove every perplexity, we must rest content with that solution that leaves the fewest problems unresolved. It is a striking testimony to the high standard of truthfulness expected from our evangelists, that a seeming discrepancy, a doubt about which side of the town a certain man was sitting on a certain day, which would cast no breath of suspicion upon the general trustworthiness of any average historian, has proved a source of grave disquietude when it occurs in these. For those whose faith cannot rest satisfied without at least provisionally harmonizing the two divergent narratives, the fact that there were in our Saviour's days two quite adjacent Jerichos, the old town and the new, affords the simplest possible solution.—ED.

III. The Casting of the Gifts into the Treasury is another proof of the relation between the second and third gospels. (γ) The Gifts to the Treasury.

ST. MARK xii. 38-44.

And in his teaching he said, Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and to *have* salutations in the market-places, and chief seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts: they which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers; these shall receive greater condemnation.

And he sat down over against the treasury, and beheld how the multitude cast money into the treasury: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came a poor widow, and she cast in two mites, which make a farthing. And he called unto him his disciples, and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than all they which are casting into the treasury: for they all did cast in of their superfluity; but she of her want did cast in all that she had, *even* all her living.

ST. LUKE xx. 45-xxi. 4.

And in the hearing of all the people he said unto his disciples, Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love salutations in the market-places, and chief seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers: these shall receive greater condemnation.

And he looked up, and saw the rich men that were casting their gifts into the treasury. And he saw a certain poor widow casting in thither two mites. And he said, Of a truth I say unto you, This poor widow cast in more than they all: for all these did of their superfluity cast in unto the gifts: but she of her want did cast in all the living that she had.

The resemblance here is the more striking, because the first part is only an abridgment of the actual discourse, as recorded fully by St. Matthew, and the other incident is not found in his gospel. There is an entire verbal agreement in the first part, varied only by three slight changes. The insertion of *φιλούντων* removes one solecism from St. Mark's style, and the substitution of *οἱ κατεσθίουσι* for *οἱ κατεσθιόντες* removes another. St. Luke, then, has adopted the words of his predecessor, and simply adapted them to the ear of more classic readers.

The changes in the latter part are more numerous. The opening statement is freed by St. Luke from a repetition that might seem inelegant. The Hebrew word, Amen, is replaced by its Greek equivalent *ἀληθῶς*, while the Roman synonym for two mites is not given. Another pleonasm of the verb and its participle is removed, a more expressive term, *ἅπαντες*, introduced, and the nature of the gifts expounded for Gentile readers, "the offerings of God."¹ The

¹ The reading here is doubtful.—ED.

closing sentence also receives a more finished structure. Every feature is thus explained, if we suppose that the third evangelist has adopted, and slightly revised, the statement of the second, so as to adapt the style to a more classical taste. The independence of the accounts, without something like a miracle, is incredible, while every variation indicates that St. Luke has given us the later narrative.¹

Thus, finally, it results from the whole inquiry, by a great variety of evidence, that the first three gospels have a close mutual relation to each other; that each later evangelist used the work of his predecessor, but combined it with original sources of information; and that the gospel of St. Luke is really the third, not only as to its actual place in the Canon, but in order of publication.

¹ My father does not include the narrative of our Lord's Passion in his detailed comparison. Da Costa in his "Four Witnesses" treats of it at considerable length ("Four Witnesses," pp. 324-433), and he is in complete accord with my father in his main contention as regards the mutual succession and interdependence of the evangelists.—ED.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE HISTORICAL RELATIONS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The law of
witnesses
applied to the
four gospels,

It was a maxim of the Divine law, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word should be established. The direct bearing of this principle on the mutual relation of the gospel witnesses does not appear to have been sufficiently observed. To satisfy this rule, it would be needful that a second evangelist should repeat and ratify the testimony of the first, with regard to all the main events contained in the earlier history. When two witnesses had thus been secured, a third would not be absolutely necessary, but still desirable. Hence it would be natural that a third evangelist should give his testimony to many of the same events, which had been reported by the others; but not so necessary to confirm the whole, as to exclude the admission of a large variety of fresh and original information. There would then be little need to multiply further testimonies, when enough had been already supplied. The chief object of a fourth writer would naturally be, to communicate further information. The second gospel would be confirmatory of the first; the third in part confirmatory, in part supplementary, to the first and second; the fourth, almost entirely, a supplement to its three predecessors. And such precisely is the relation which the gospel of St. John sustains to the three others.

This very feature, however, of the distinctness of its events from those previously recorded, has concurred with its fulness of doctrinal statement, and the simple majesty of its style, to conceal from many readers the internal evidence of its historical reality. And hence the mythical theorists have sought to disparage it, as a mere dream of

high-wrought fancy, designed to glorify Jesus, with hardly any groundwork in his actual history. It has been endeavoured to prove its statements contradictory to those of the other evangelists, and thus either to set it aside as a Christian legend, or to throw doubt on their consenting testimony, and involve the whole life of our Lord in utter uncertainty and confusion. It becomes, then, of great importance to unfold the supplementary character of this gospel, and to show that the indirectness of its relation to the others only deepens the force of their combined evidence by a series of undesigned and exact coincidences, the more impressive because they lie beneath the surface, and entirely escape the notice of a superficial and careless reader.

On the first and general view of St. John's gospel, we should be ready to suppose that it was a doctrinal rather than an historical supplement to the others, and that the writer, occupied with those sublime discourses of our Lord, and those wonderful glimpses of his divine glory, had lost sight entirely of the lower elements of time and place, which would ensure its authority as real history. But whether we ascribe it to a conscious purpose, or to the secret overruling of the Spirit of God, we shall see that both objects are harmonized together, and that there is a striking unity and completeness in its purely historical relations to the other gospels.

I. The three first gospels agree in confining themselves, almost entirely, to the record of our Lord's ministry in Galilee. This transfer of its scene from Judea stands prominent in the opening of St. Matthew, and is justified by the direct appeal to an inspired prophecy. "The land of Zabulon and of Naphthali, by the way of the sea, in Galilee of the Gentiles" (Matt. iv. 15), was the place appointed for the first dawning of this light from heaven. The only exception is that of the last journey to Jerusalem, which they all record very fully in its closing portion, because the substance of the whole gospel was comprised in the atoning death and glorious resurrection of the Lord Jesus.

It might be inferred, however, from several passing hints, even in these gospels, that our Saviour's ministry was not

St. John's gospel no mere doctrinal supplement, but with important historical relations to the rest.

(1) Gives the Judean ministry.

entirely confined to Galilee, and that he paid more than one visit to Jerusalem. To say nothing of the presumption from the law of Moses, which prescribed attendance at the yearly feasts, the passages Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34, are alone decisive on this point. Accordingly, the fourth gospel derives its historical unity from this systematic omission in the others, and records distinctly, and almost exclusively, the ministry of Jesus in Judea and Jerusalem.

There are only two exceptions to this general law, with regard to the theatre of the fourth gospel, in chapters vi. and xxi. And in these very exceptions the supplementary character may be clearly traced. The scene in both of them is the sea of Galilee, to which the prophecy of Isaiah referred our Saviour's ministry, in the foresight of his rejection at Jerusalem the natural seat and centre of Messiah's kingdom. The occasion, in each instance, illustrates the principle on which the transfer was made. In the former case, it was near the Jewish Passover, when our Lord would have gone up to Jerusalem, unless restrained by the murderous malice of the Jews. In the latter instance, it was after his resurrection, when his rejection by the rulers and people of Jerusalem was complete, and when he was about to crown his ministry by the last solemn message to his apostles and all his disciples on a mountain in Galilee.

(2) Supplies the interval from the close of the Temptation to the Public Ministry in Galilee, St. John i. 19-iv. 43.

II. The first interval, omitted in the former gospels, extends from the close of the Temptation to the return into Galilee, when our Lord's public ministry in that province began. The fourth gospel punctually supplies the intervening events; and yet the links are so simple and inartificial, that scarcely one reader in a hundred would observe how precisely the limits tally with those of the previously omitted portion. The narrative begins with the testimony of the Baptist to Jesus, occasioned by a message of inquiry on the part of the Pharisees, and no statement could appear more widely removed from any purpose of mere chronology. The writer then continues: "The next day John seeth Jesus coming to him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. . . And I knew him not, but he that sent me to baptize with

water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God."

From these words it is plain that the Baptism of Jesus was now past. But the other gospels tell us that the Temptation followed immediately, and since Jesus was now on the banks of the Jordan, and the next day but one (verses 35, 44) returned into Galilee, the Temptation also must plainly have been ended. And further, since the scene of John's baptism was clearly on the route between the wilderness and Galilee, it is plain that Jesus had just returned from the wilderness, when the Baptist gave this noble testimony to his character, as the Lamb of God. And hence it follows that the message of the Pharisees, with which the gospel begins its history, must have been on the last day of the Temptation, or else the very day after its close.

From this point four successive days are marked, till a return into Galilee, which might at first sight be confounded with the return in the former gospels. But the writer does not leave us long exposed to this mistaken impression. He mentions the marriage in Cana on the third day, a short abode at Capernaum, a visit to Jerusalem at the Passover, and then a ministry of Jesus in the land of Judea, while John also was baptizing at Ænon. He then adds the brief remark—"for John was not yet cast into prison." It follows that the return into Galilee, in chap. i., was earlier than that which all the other gospels mention after John's imprisonment. And accordingly, in chap. iv., St. John mentions a second return into Galilee, occasioned by the jealousy of the Pharisees, which has all the features required by the statements of the other evangelists. Having conducted our Lord to Cana, where a second miracle occurs, the writer abruptly suspends his continuous narrative just before the visit to Nazareth, mentioned by St. Luke, and that later abode at Capernaum, which is recorded alike in all the three gospels. The dovetailing of the two narratives is thus complete.

(3) The Feast,
John v. (the
Passover),
nearly co-
incident with
Luke vi. 1.

III. The next chapter is introduced with the words, "After these things there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." The comparison with other passages of the gospel yields of itself a strong presumption that this feast was a Passover. For in every other case the feast is specified by name, whether the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles, or the Dedication. Hence the simplest reason for the omission here will be, that the feast was virtually specified, in the view of the writer; since he has repeatedly named the Passover, and referred to it by the general title, the feast, and hitherto has alluded to no other. Thus in chap. iv., it is said of the Galileans, "they also went up to the feast." Also it is clear from the other gospels that there was an interval of two years between the Passover which preceded the teaching in Galilee, and that which followed the miracle of the five thousand. Hence it results naturally that this feast was the very next Passover, and that St. John notes our Lord's attendance, just as he notices the reason why he forbore to attend on its next recurrence.

Now there is here an indirect coincidence with the other gospels. For the main feature of the account is the deep resentment of the Jews against our Lord, for an alleged breach of the Sabbath; and from this time the Evangelist dates a systematic persecution. But in St. Luke we find the same controversy renewed on a second-first Sabbath, or the Sabbath next after the Passover, and then continued on another Sabbath, when a council was held how they might destroy him, and Jesus withdrew to the sea, to avoid their malice. The historical agreement, though far from self-evident, is thus perfect in its kind. With the second year, a stage of more deliberate and malicious opposition had begun, and the main excuse of it, in the eyes of the Pharisees, was our Lord's supposed breach of the Sabbath, and impious claim of Divine honour.

(4) The
Miracle of the
Five Thousand
nearly co-
incident with
Mission of the
Twelve.

IV. The Miracle of the Five Thousand is the only event, before Passion Week, which is common to St. John with the other gospels. It serves thus to bind the fourth gospel into close historic unity with the others. But it also

supplies a link of the chronology, for St. John alone tells us distinctly that the Passover was then near at hand. The main object, however, seems to be, that he may introduce the striking discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum. But besides several minute particulars, such as an eyewitness alone would be likely to give, there is at the close a striking indirect agreement with the other gospels. "Have not I chosen you twelve? and one of you is a devil." No allusion has been made in this gospel to the selection of the Twelve Apostles, but the statement of the other three evangelists is thus confirmed, as a notorious truth. The agreement is indeed still more complete, since the other gospels state that the Twelve had just returned from their first public mission, before the miracle of the five thousand. There is thus a secret, but emphatic appeal, to the recent proof of his especial choice, which our Lord had given them in that solemn embassy.

V. The next portion of the gospel relates to a visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles, vii. 1-x. 21, in the last year of our Saviour's ministry. Now, from the language of the evangelist, vi. 4, vii. 1, it results clearly that an interval of eighteen months occurred between this and the former visit. And this evidently agrees with the statements in the other gospels, who represent Galilee as the main scene of our Lord's public labours. In fact, St. John, whose purpose is to record the visits to Jerusalem, is led here, from the long interval between them, to recount the miracle and attendant discourse, which happened at the time when such a visit would naturally have occurred, and then to specify at the close the reason why Jesus still abode in Galilee.

During this last year, after the Transfiguration, there is an hiatus in the two first gospels, and distinct allusions to a transfer of the ministry from Galilee (Matt. xvii. 22). The fourth gospel concurs with this view. For it mentions the presence of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles (October), and of Dedication (December), and then remarks that "he went away again beyond Jordan, to the place where John was baptizing at the first, and there abode." The simplest

(5) Light
thrown on the
Perean
Ministry.

construction is, that he had previously retired thither after the Feast of Tabernacles, and now returned again after the Feast of Dedication. There was thus a considerable interval, from October to the end of December, during which the ministry of Jesus was in Perea and not in Galilee, a transfer which is probably intended (Matt. xix. 1, Mark x. 1).

(6) St. John's account of the Raising of Lazarus linked with the other gospels.

VI. The Resurrection of Lazarus is like a distinct episode in the fourth gospel. Yet even here we have several links of historical connection with the three other evangelists. "The village of Martha and Mary" is a clear and definite allusion to the passage, Luke x. 38-42; while the words that follow are an allusion, not less clear, to the account given by St. Matthew and St. Mark of the anointing in Bethany, joined with the promise to Mary of perpetual honour. The miracle itself, when compared with the two others, of the widow's son and the ruler's daughter, forms a climax of Divine power; and the language of Jesus, "our friend Lazurus sleepeth," finds its exact parallel in the words of the the three other gospels, "Give place, for the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth."

(7) St. John's account of the Resurrection confirms the early gospels.

VII. In the accounts of the Resurrection, the fourth gospel equally confirms the previous narratives, and supplies their omissions. St. Mark had stated that Jesus appeared first of all to Mary Magdalene, and here we have a distinct account of that appearance. St. Luke had stated that Peter ran to the sepulchre, after a report from the women. We are taught here that the report was brought by Mary Magdalene, and that John accompanied Peter in his visit to the tomb. St. Luke had recounted the appearance to the eleven the same evening; and here a varied report of it is given. We have then an appearance, a week later, which is peculiar to this gospel, and relates to the Apostle Thomas, of whom no mention is made in any of the earlier gospels, except in the list of the Twelve. Last of all, St. Matthew had recorded briefly the main appearance of Jesus on a mountain in Galilee, while St. Mark and St. Luke mention only those in or near Jerusalem. And the fourth gospel confirms and completes their statements, by exhibiting the apostles in Galilee after the resurrection, and recording an

appearance to seven of them, probably just before the public appearance to all the twelve and the five hundred brethren. At the same time, the account may be viewed in another light, as a supplement to St. Luke, since the two miraculous draughts are beautifully related to each other, both in their strong resemblance and partial contrast. In the former, the net is broken; in the latter, no injury is sustained from the immense draught. In the former, Peter offers the prayer, "Depart from me," in the other, he casts himself into the sea, in his ardent desire to be near his Lord and Saviour. The contrast, as well as the resemblance to the former miracle, is very striking, and serves to complete their common significance.

The fourth gospel, then, although the events which it records are supplementary to the other gospels, contains numerous links of connection, which evince their common truth, and bind the whole into one harmonious and consistent narrative of the chief events in the life of Jesus.

APPENDIX TO BOOK I.

ON THE GOSPEL CHRONOLOGY.

My father in his later years gave much thought to questions of gospel criticism. The only published fruit of these studies is the little essay on "The Right Estimation of the MSS. Evidence in the Text of the New Testament," which was welcomed by many who shared his own distrust of the principles on which the Revisers made selection of their text. He has also left in somewhat incomplete condition unpublished MSS. upon the gospel chronology, the language spoken by our Lord, and the true nature of Scripture inspiration, subjects all more or less akin to the discussions of the "Horæ." Some portion of these studies may possibly be published at a later date. Meanwhile, although the precise fixing of the gospel chronology is not *essential* to the present argument, it was so closely associated with it in my father's mind, that it may add completeness to the work to state in a short appendix the results at which he had arrived after a careful study of various authorities, and to preface this brief list of dates with extracts from his expressed opinions regarding the importance to Christian evidence of a clear gospel chronology, and the possibility of attaining a far larger measure of light upon it than some have deemed to be attainable.

First, as to the hopefulness of the inquiry, with regard to questions both of chronology and geography. He says: "The wisdom of God seems purposely to have arranged that a complete solution of the various questions should not be attained till the time of the end, so that the word of God through successive generations should always offer some unsolved questions to stimulate curiosity, and to reward patient and persevering study. But as the effect of every unsolved question or false solution must be to cause some degree of dimness in our appre-

hension of the sacred message, we have every reason to hope and to expect that persevering study in the spirit of faith and humility will be rewarded with growing insight, and the greater part, if not the whole, of the doubts and ambiguities disappear by the inductive study both of the works and word of God."

In a similar spirit he remarks about the omission of St. John to mention the name of the feast referred to at the opening of his fifth chapter: "If it be asked why the Holy Spirit has not been pleased to simplify the task of arranging the narrative in that way, a simple and weighty reason may be given. The chronology, like the rest of the message, is so revealed as to compel a careful and complete comparison of the evidence in all the four evangelists, and to make it impossible to attain satisfactory conclusions by any shorter cut, and in the neglect of any one of the four narratives. The depreciation of the three first evangelists is not the way to obtain the full help which the added data of the fourth gospel really supply."

In full accordance with these views are the principles laid down by him for the successful conduct of this investigation.

"There are three main conditions which reason prescribes as essential to success in every attempt to settle controverted and difficult points of sacred criticism. First, that these questions should be approached in the spirit of humility and reverence, in the spirit enjoined on Moses at the Bush, 'Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.' It is most unlikely that those who deal with the Living Word of God as a medical student deals with a lifeless corpse in a dissecting room will be rewarded by any solution of its difficulties, or fresh insight into its meaning.

"A second essential for successful research is, in the investigation of each disputed point, to collate the whole evidence bearing upon it which is to be found in the Word of God.

"The third requisite is, to avoid observing and complicating the problem by mixing the chaff of unsifted human and fallible traditions with the genuine data of the inspired Scriptures. A small proportion of such chaff introduced into one of these biblical problems may render its solution impossible, as a few drops of some poison are enough to extinguish life.

"I believe that in every case where these three conditions have been observed, some real success will be found to have followed.

However great the present confusion and mist, there is no reason whatever why humble and patient students of Scripture should despair in this 'time of the end' of experiencing the truth of the promise, 'The wise shall understand,' and attaining a deliverance from the greater part at least of the controversies and ambiguities by which the pure truth and perfect harmony of the Divine Scriptures has been so extensively clouded and obscured down to the present day."

Here, in the third principle laid down, the stress must be laid upon the word "*unsifted*." No one who has followed my father's labours in this matter of scriptural chronology could deem him "a despiser of antiquity," only he was most jealous of placing any authority, ecclesiastical or secular, upon an equal level with the Word of God. This will be rendered clear by a yet further extract.

"The existence of so many unsolved doubts and controversies among Christian scholars and divines is an evil to be much deplored on the eve of what seems likely to be a systematic and fierce assault of unbelief on the very foundations of moral truth and revealed religion. These mists are mainly due, I conceive, to an imperfect use of the ample materials which the New Testament itself supplies, when compared with the still extant remains of Christian antiquity, for the explanation of its own meaning, and for the solution of the various controversies which have grown out of its statements. The materials for the solution of these problems are of two kinds: the more indefinite and complex, which have an analogy with classical study and the muscles and nerves in the human frame; and the more definite, which have a closer resemblance to the vertebræ and bones of the human skeleton, and a closer analogy to the truths of mathematics."

With such opinions my father could not be content, as Bishop Westcott almost seems to be (so far at least as the note, p. 284 of his "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels," is concerned), to leave it as an open question whether the ministry of Christ extended through one year only, or through ten; and the mischief likely to result from needless acquiescence in such a measure of uncertainty he clearly points out thus:—

"The effect of pre-dating or post-dating the whole gospel history three years is of a secondary kind, and only disturbs a certain number of its relations with the profane annals of the

first century. But an error as to the duration of the public ministry, contracting it to one year, or extending it to ten or eleven years, is fatal, if not to the veracity of the evangelists, at least to their skill and competence in providing a firm and clear basis for the historical faith of Christians in every later age. Four witnesses may be thoroughly and intimately acquainted with a person, and ignorant of his age to the extent of three years; but if they profess to give a detailed account of his public acts as a statesman or a king, and leave it uncertain at last whether his reign lasted ten years or only one year, they suggest the strongest doubts as to their competence as historians. It is not firm and solid history, but gaseous and floating legends alone, which can without extreme violence be either contracted into one-third of their real space, or expanded in the same proportion."

He cherished the hope that the continuously mathematical bent of his own studies might enable him to supply what he deemed a deficiency in many able Christian advocates, and to render a real service to the Church by throwing some fresh light upon these doubtful questions of chronology. I will conclude with one more extract that clearly gives his views upon the point:—

"The words of Christ in his parable, near the close of his ministry (St. Luke xiii. 7), 'These three years I come seeking fruit on this figtree and find none; cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?' the prophecy of Daniel, 'In the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease' (Dan. ix. 27); and the express mention of three Passovers in St. John, and the interposed mention of the cornfields and the Paschal Sabbath in St. Luke, between the Passover of St. John ii. 13 and vi. 4, form a cumulative proof of the correctness of the main tradition, from Chrysostom and Bede onward, that our Lord lived three decades of years before his public ministry began, that these were followed by three years from Passover to Passover of public ministry, and these again followed and crowned by the sacred triad of the Day of Crucifixion, the Burial, and the Resurrection.

"At every step, with patient and careful inquiry, the mist and fog will disappear, and be replaced by clear sunlight. The earthly life of the Lord of Glory, being the centre of the wonderful scheme of Divine Providence, will disclose harmonies

more various and manifold amidst their seeming complexity and disorder, than the planetary motions as interpreted by the law of gravitation—

‘Mazes intricate,
Eccentric, interwolved, yet regular
Then most, when most irregular they seem,’

Paradise Lost, Book V.

The relation of the four gospel narratives to each other is precisely of the same kind,—very complex and involved on a casual glance, but revealing with every successive step of patient and humble inquiry more and more mysteries of Divine art and wisdom in their own structure, as well as in the message of Divine grace and love of which they are the appointed treasury for successive generations of mankind.”

With this brief preface I will proceed to give the chronological results at which my father had arrived after a close study of the Scriptures, and a careful comparison of the works of Scaliger, 1583; Usher, 1673; Petavius, 1703; Hales, Benson, Cunningham, Greswell, Jarvis, and Browne in the earlier, and Clinton, Lewin, Alford, Wordsworth, Wieseler, Ellicott, Thomson, and McClellan in the latter half of the present century.

Oct., B.C. 6. Vision of Zacharias (census commenced).

March 25, B.C. 5. Annunciation.

Midsummer, B.C. 5. Birth of Baptist.

[July, B.C. 5. Journey of Antipater to Rome.]

Dec. 25, B.C. 5. Birth of our Lord.

Feb. 3, B.C. 4. The Presentation.

End of same month. Visit of Magi,

[March, B.C. 4. Arrival and sentence of Antipater.]

[March 12, B.C. 4. Eclipse and execution of Rabbis.]

Massacre of Bethlehem.

Nov., A.D. 25. Fifteenth year of joint reign of Tiberius.

Midsummer, A.D. 26. Government of Pilate.

Baptist 30 years old.

Late summer or autumn, A.D. 26. His public message.

About Feb. 3, A.D. 27. Baptism of our Lord.

April, A.D. 27. The Passover of St. John ii.

April, A.D. 30. The Passover of the Crucifixion.

My father also strongly held that the Crucifixion took place on Friday, the 15th of Nisan, and that the Lord's Supper was the true Paschal rite, and not a mere anticipation of it.

BOOK II.

AN ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE CHRONOLOGY AND DATE OF THE BOOK OF ACTS, TOGETHER WITH THE DATES OF THE THREE EARLIER GOSPELS.

INTRODUCTION.

THE NATURE OF THE ARGUMENT.

THE mutual relation of the gospels established by the internal evidence is an important help towards fixing the date of their publication, and thereby proving their just claim to the character of authentic history.

The third gospel and the Book of Acts were both addressed to the same person, Theophilus, whose name appears in the preface in each case, and they are plainly two successive works of the same author.

Hence, if we can ascertain the date of the Book of Acts, it will follow that three of the gospels must have been published earlier, and so much earlier, that the first was in circulation before the second was written; and the first and second were both in circulation before the composition of the third.

We shall therefore endeavour to determine the chronology of the Book of Acts, its date and authorship, and the probable occasion when it was published; and we may thus infer, by a comparison with its contents, the probable occasion and date of the three earlier gospels.

The authenticity of St. John's gospel is directly proved

by external evidence of the strongest kind, and its authority is almost independent of the date when it was written. In the present work this inquiry has therefore been omitted, as of less importance, but some of the objections urged against this gospel as being inaccurate in detail will be examined afterwards, and its apostolic origin confirmed, so as to form a key-stone to the arch of historical testimony.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

BEFORE we can ascertain the date of the Book of Acts, it is needful to determine as nearly as possible the chronology of the events that are recorded in it. Such an inquiry is interesting for its own sake, and serves to illustrate and confirm the reality of the whole narrative. There is a divergence of six or seven years even among recent chronologers, which calls for a renewed and careful examination of the evidence.

The need of
the inquiry.

The ascension of Christ and the release of St. Paul from his imprisonment at Rome are the limiting events of the history in the Book of Acts. Their dates, according to Usher and Hug, are A.D. 33 and A.D. 65, while others place the apostle's release one or two years later. Mr. Greswell fixes the limits at A.D. 30 and A.D. 61, while Dr. Burton contracts the whole within a narrower compass, A.D. 33 and A.D. 58.

The first question is, the date of the Crucifixion and Ascension; this, however, is more closely connected with the chronology of the gospels. The notes of time, Acts i.-vi., are so few, that a difference of two or three years in the date of the Ascension would have little influence on the date of the later events after Saul's conversion. The date of Eusebius and Usher, A.D. 33, was very generally received in the last century, but recent chronologers, with one or two exceptions, incline to an earlier date. Ideler, Benson, Browne, and Clinton place it A.D. 29, Dr. Jarvis in A.D. 28, Mr. Greswell and Foster, Archbishop Thomson, Bishop Elliott, and Mr. McClellan in A.D. 30, and Dr. Hales and Dr. Burton in A.D. 31.

The date of
the Ascension,
A.D. 30.

The date of Africanus and Greswell, April, A.D. 30, may be established with high probability by the following reasons:—

First, the death of Herod the Great, from the direct and indirect statements of Josephus, may be assigned to B.C. 3. The birth of our Lord must be placed between the limits of December, B.C. 5, and April, B.C. 4. The gospels of St. Luke and St. John (compare St. Luke iii. 23, and St. John ii. 23) imply that thirty years of our Lord's life were complete at the Passover in St. John ii., or shortly before it. This will fix that Passover to A.D. 27; and this agrees with the statement of St. Luke iii., which places the opening of the Baptist's ministry in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, if the years of Tiberius are reckoned from his pro-consular dominion or supreme power over the provinces.¹

Again, the gospels imply an interval of just three years from that Passover to the Crucifixion. One of these closes at the time of the second-first Sabbath (St. Luke vi. 1), another soon after the miracle of the Five Thousand (St. John vi. 1), and the last at the Crucifixion, which is thus referred to April, A.D. 30. This date is only three months later than the year of the Gemini,² A.D. 29, which has the most traditional evidence in its favour, and the interval of forty years to the fall of Jerusalem has many analogies in Jewish history.

II. The dates of the Roman emperors within the apostolic period are as follows:—

Tiberius,	Aug. 19,	A.D. 14.
Caius (Caligula),	March 16,	A.D. 37.
Claudius,	Jan.,	A.D. 41.
Nero,	Sept. 13,	A.D. 54.
Galba,	June,	A.D. 68.
Fall of Jerusalem,	August,	A.D. 70.

¹ This power was committed to him by Augustus two years before his own decease. We have an exact precedent for the style of reckoning in Scripture in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, whose reign is dated two years earlier in Judea than by the Canon of Ptolemy, or by Daniel at Babylon.

² See Greswell, "Harmony of Gospels," vol. i. p. 455, who quotes Tertullian, Lactantius, and Augustine (all Africans) to the effect that Christ was crucified when the two Gemini (Rubellius and Rufus) were consuls, *i.e.*, A.U.C. 782.—ED.

One writer, Dr. Jarvis, has latterly departed from these well-established dates, placing them all one year higher, but the usual chronology rests on a variety of proofs which amount to absolute demonstration.

We may infer from these dates that the history of Acts xii.-xvii. (see Acts xi. 28, xviii. 2) was included within the reign of Claudius, or Jan., A.D. 41-Sept., A.D. 54; but beyond this general limit the list of the emperors yields no information of the exact time when each event occurred. Our data must be borrowed mainly from the history of Josephus, though two important links are supplied by St. Paul himself in the Epistle to the Galatians and the second Epistle to the Corinthians. The time of the death of Herod Agrippa is the first and cardinal date. The second is the interval of fourteen years (Gal. ii. 1) either from the conversion of St. Paul, or from his first visit to Jerusalem, until some later visit, of which several particulars are there given. When this double ambiguity has been removed, we need still further guidance in order to determine how much of the interval lies before, and how much follows after the death of Herod. And here the adjustment requires to combine several data, each separately inadequate, before we can arrive at a certain decision.

III. The death of Herod Agrippa (Acts xii.) furnishes the most definite mark of time in the whole narrative. It may be fixed, by the express testimony of Josephus, to A.D. 44. Since, however, Mr. Greswell assigns it to A.D. 43, and Dr. Burton half inclines to the same date, it is needful to vindicate the common view of nearly all chronologers by placing that testimony clearly before the reader.

The date of
Herod's death,
A.D. 44.

First, Josephus tells us in "Ant.," xix. 8. 2, that Claudius, on his accession, invested Agrippa with the dominion over Judea and Samaria, in addition to the tetrarchy of Antipas, which he had previously received from Caligula. After the third year of his reign was completed, he held the festival at Cæsarea, when he was smitten with disease, and died within a few days. His appointment, then, at the earliest, was January, A.D. 41, and the festival must have been later than January, A.D. 44. Now Peter was imprisoned at a

Passover, and the history in Acts seems to imply that the audience of the Tyrians and the death of Herod were very soon after, and before the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch. Hence the Passover must have been that of A.D. 44, and Herod's death was probably not later than the Pentecost of that year.

Again, we are told ("Ant.," xviii. 6. 10) that Caius (Caligula) invested Herod with the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias soon after his own accession, or April-June, A.D. 37. The next year Agrippa sailed to Judea. Upon this Herodias prompted Antipas to set out for Rome, in order to solicit the same title of king, and prevailed on him with difficulty to make the voyage, after some delay. He sailed evidently the next year, or A.D. 39, and met the emperor at Baiæ in Campania, where Caius is known from other evidence to have been not long before his birthday, August 31, A.D. 39. Antipas and Herodias were then banished into Gaul, and the tetrarchies were given to Herod Agrippa. Claudius, on his accession, confirmed to him this government, and added Judea and Samaria. ("Ant.," xix. 5. 1.)

Now Josephus ("Ant.," xix. 8. 2) places the death of Herod "in the seventh year of his reign, for he reigned four years under Caius, three of them over Philip's tetrarchy alone, and in the fourth that of Herod was added; and besides these, he reigned three years under Claudius." If his appointment were in May or June, A.D. 37, his death, soon after the Passover, A.D. 44, would be at the close of his seventh year. From May, A.D. 37, to the close of A.D. 39, when tidings of the deposition of Antipas would reach Judea, are more than two years and a half, or three years current. From that time to the death of Caligula would be little more than one full year, after which three full years were completed before his death.

In the "Wars" (ii. 11. 6) we are told that Herod had reigned three years at his death, as he had also governed his tetrarchies three other years. Here, again, three complete years are distinctly assigned to him, after the accession of Claudius, and the only divergence is in reckoning three years, instead of four, for his previous rule. But this

may be explained very simply by the fact that he sailed from Rome, and actually assumed the government, only in the second year of Caligula, or A.D. 38, whence three years only are current to the end of that emperor's reign.

Thus all the notes of time in Josephus evidently agree, and fix the death of Agrippa to the first half of A.D. 44, while the Book of Acts would lead us to place it not very long after the Passover. The reasoning of Mr. Greswell, by which he would place it a year earlier, involves a rejection of the express statement of Josephus, twice repeated, that three years from the accession of Claudius had been completed at the time of its occurrence.

IV. The next help towards the determination of the dates is the passage in Galatians ii. 1. We are told by St. Paul in that epistle, that three years after his conversion he went up to Jerusalem (Acts ix. 28), and then that "after fourteen years" (διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν) he went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus, on account of certain false brethren who were troubling the Church at Antioch. Three questions may here be raised: (1) which is the visit thus referred to in Gal. ii. 1; (2) whether the two intervals of three years and fourteen years respectively are successive, or both measured from the same date; and (3) lastly, whether the years are current or complete. Since the intervals after the council at Jerusalem may be nearly determined from St. Luke's narrative, the relative dates of the whole series will be also fixed when the above questions have been solved; but their absolute dates will vary, as more or less of the fourteen years is placed between the death of Herod and the council at Jerusalem.

(1) Four opinions have been held with regard to the visit in Galatians, that it was the second, third, or fourth of those mentioned by St. Luke,¹ or else a visit not recorded by him, and supposed to have been shortly before the time of the council. But the view of Mr. Browne, who refers it to the second, and of Mr. Greswell, who identifies it with the fourth visit, may be disproved by a direct comparison of the

The passage (Gal. ii. 1) fixes the council (Acts xv.) to the fourteenth year from Saul's conversion.

¹ Acts xi. 30; xv. 2; xviii. 21, 22.

letter with the history; and the only presumption in favour of Paley's hypothesis, that it was a private visit shortly before the council, vanishes on a closer examination. Three-fourths of the ablest writers agree that the visit at the time of the council (Acts xv.) is the one of which the apostle is here speaking, and their opinion has been established, I think, in the "*Horæ Apostolicæ*,"¹ by the internal evidence of the passage alone.

(2) Next are the two periods, of three and fourteen years, successive, or do they alike date from Saul's conversion? Opinions have been much divided on this point. Petavius, Usher, Hug, Dr. Burton, adopt the former view, while Browne, Greswell, and many others, prefer the latter. Even on internal grounds, the supposition that the starting-point is common for the two periods seems to me the more probable. The word *again* would be just as applicable, whether the period were reckoned from his conversion, or from his former visit. The scope of the passage almost requires us to refer it to his conversion. For his main object is to remind the Galatians how long he had continued, after he was commissioned by Christ, without any formal or official intercourse with the other apostles; and thus to exalt the importance of his original call, and show the unimportance, in a question of apostolic authority, of that brief visit which lasted only fifteen days.² Hence he would naturally date his second visit, like the first, from the time of that miraculous revelation at Damascus, which was the one source of all his apostolic authority.

When we compare the history in Acts, the reasons preponderate still more in favour of this view. Only one year is there specified between the first and third visits. The rest of the interval must be distributed into four parts,—the stay at Tarsus (Acts ix. 30), the stay at Antioch before the circuit (Acts xii. 25-xiii. 3), the circuit itself (Acts xiii.-

¹ "*Horæ Apostolicæ*," p. 200. The "*Horæ Apostolicæ*" is my father's supplement to Paley's "*Horæ Paulinæ*," published with it by the Religious Tract Society. It has had a wide circulation.

² His only purpose in mentioning that visit at all was to preclude a possible charge of disingenuous concealment of facts.

xiv. 26), and a renewed stay after the close (Acts xiv. 27, 28). Dr. Burton infers from the text that these latter amounted only to two years; and yet it is clear that the two former, so far as the text alone is concerned, do not require a longer time than the others. Yet, if we adopt his view of the period in Galatians these four intervals amount collectively to thirteen years. Hence it is plain that the construction of the intervals in Galatians, as parallel with each other, agrees much better with the other indications in St. Luke's narrative, and ought on this ground to be preferred.

(3) For the same reason, as well as from the grammatical form of the phrase, it is probable that the years were current. It will follow that the council was held at Jerusalem in the fourteenth year from the apostle's conversion.

We have next to inquire how large a part of this period follows the second visit, and the death of Herod. Dr. Burton confines the interval to two, while Professor Hug extends it to eight years. The chief reason assigned for the shorter period is the assumption, that the Book of Acts does not naturally imply a longer space than a single year to have elapsed during the circuit. But in this reasoning there is a great inconsistency. The narrative does not *require* a longer space than one year for the stay at Tarsus. We might even infer, from the entire silence of St. Luke about the apostle's labours in that place, that his stay there occupied a shorter time than his extensive and laborious circuit through Asia Minor. Yet the reasoning now examined, while it would limit the circuit to four or five months, enlarges the stay at Tarsus to nine or ten years. Now since we have no record of the apostle's labours during this period, and hardly an allusion to them, such a protraction of its length is unnatural and incredible. No distribution of the time could well do greater violence to common sense, since the historian has twice specified "a long time" in connection with the latter period, but nowhere implies that the former was of any long continuance.

On the view here preferred, the whole interval from Saul's first visit to Jerusalem (Acts ix. 26) until the council, exclusive of the year at Antioch before his second visit (Acts

xi. 26), will be nine complete, or ten current years. It is natural to conclude that about half the time, which would be four complete, or five current years, followed the second visit; and this leaves five complete years for the double stay at Tarsus and Antioch before the death of Herod.

To determine the arrangement upon fuller evidence, the data from the rest of the history must be combined. Each of them separately is indefinite, and even when they have all been consulted the result continues in some measure indeterminate. The chief events to be considered are the martyrdom of Stephen, the commission to Damascus, the time of St. Paul's escape from thence, and of the jurisdiction of Aretas; the time of rest to the churches, the length of the stay at Tarsus, compared with the first circuit; the succession of Roman governors, and especially the appointment and deposition of Felix; the decree of Claudius, the priesthood of Ananias, and the probable time of St. Paul's liberation from Rome.

The date of
the martyr-
dom of Stephen
probably Pen-
tecost, A.D. 36.

V. The martyrdom of Stephen is the first cardinal event of the history after the Ascension. Petavius, Tillemont, Cave, and Burton¹ place it in the same year with that event. On the other hand, the chronicle of Hippolytus, and the "Recognitions" of Clement, place it seven years after the Ascension, which is also the view of Mr. Greswell in his "Dissertations." It seems quite incredible that, while the whole Book of Acts comprises a space of more than thirty years, the first nine chapters should be contracted within the narrow limits of seven or eight months. When we consider the advice of Gamaliel, with the forbearance of the rulers to which it led, the great increase in the number of the disciples, the feud in the Church, the appointment of the seven deacons and their labours before the trial began, we cannot reasonably allow for these events a shorter space than two years, while it is clearly possible that the period was still longer. The chief help to a decision, beyond mere conjecture, seems to be found in the reasoning that now follows.

¹ Tillemont, "Eccl. Memoirs," vol. ii., note 2. Cave, "Life of St. Stephen the Proto-martyr," c. xxii.

Vitellius, as we learn from Josephus,¹ visited Jerusalem at the Passover, A.D. 36, having superseded Pilate not long before; and then deprived Caiaphas of the high-priesthood, which he gave to Jonathan, the son of Ananias or Annas. He also granted the Jews their request, to have the priestly garments in their own custody, and wrote to Tiberius for a confirmation of that privilege. The next year he visited it again at the time of some feast, while marching against Aretas. While there, he received the news of the emperor's death, administered the oath of fidelity to Caius, deposed Jonathan from the priesthood, and appointed Theophilus in his stead. Mr. Greswell supposes both visits to have occurred in A.D. 37, at the Passover and Pentecost. But this is clearly erroneous, for two reasons. The interval is too short for the events which come between the visits in the history, including a return of Vitellius to Antioch, an expedition against Artabanus, the preparation for a campaign against Aretas, and a second journey by land to Jerusalem. The deposition, also, of Jonathan, so soon after his appointment, is highly improbable, and the interval from the death of Tiberius to the Pentecost is too long. For Tiberius died March 16, and the date of the Passover that year would be almost certainly April 18, and not March 18, which is three days before the equinox, and therefore a month too early. On the other hand, from March 16 to April 25, which would be the close of the feast, leaves an interval just sufficient for the news to arrive, and is therefore in exact harmony with the statement of Josephus.

Now the account of Stephen's death implies an assumption of authority, by the high priest and Sanhedrim, the very reverse of their conduct at the time of the Crucifixion. In both cases there was an unanimous condemnation on a charge of blasphemy. Here, however, there is no appeal to a Roman governor, and no scruple expressed as before, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death" (St. John xviii. 31). The stoning of Stephen was the legal Jewish

¹ "Ant.," xviii. 4. 5.

punishment, not the act of a mere rabble, and was done with attention to legal forms. "The witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul" (Acts vii. 58). We can hardly avoid the inference, that Pilate had been already removed from office, and that there was a kind of interregnum in the Roman government, which seemed to favour the Sanhedrim in their bold resumption of the power of life and death.

These indications are satisfied, if we refer the event to the high-priesthood of Jonathan. There was then no actual procurator, but only a temporary substitute. Upon a complaint of the Jews, Pilate had been sent to Rome in disgrace, and a privilege been granted them, which removed, in their eyes, a very odious badge of their own subjection. This might embolden them to resume the prerogative of life and death, while the high priest might wish to signalize his office by some act of severity against the growing sect of the Nazarenes. This usurpation of a power, which the Romans guarded with extreme jealousy, may also account for the conduct of Vitellius, in deposing Jonathan so soon after he had appointed him. The death of Stephen, if the above reasoning be just, would fall between the Passovers of A.D. 36 and 37. If we place it about Pentecost, there is time for the mission of Philip in Samaria before the Feast of Tabernacles, which, as the greatest of all, might probably be the festival from which the eunuch was on his return.

If we consider the general scale of the history, a space of six years for the seven first chapters, or less than one-fifth of the whole period, for one-fourth of the whole narrative, cannot seem excessive. There are four intervals mentioned, each of which might possibly, and one of them must certainly, have been of considerable length. At the same time, since there is nothing in the text which we might not conceive, on the shortest estimate, to have been compressed into about two years, the date, Pentecost A.D. 36, seems more probable on this account than that of Mr. Greswell, who defers the event one year later, or until seven full years from the Ascension.

VI. The conversion of Saul, and his first visit to Jerusalem, furnish the next imperfect criteria, as they are connected with the rule of Aretas in Damascus, and that rest of the churches which followed the removal of the apostle to Tarsus.

The conversion of Saul, the authority of Aretas, and rest of the churches.

From the account of St. Luke, it seems a reasonable inference that the journey to Damascus was not less than half a year, nor more than a whole year, after Stephen's death. During the interval, Saul had continued the persecution both in Jerusalem and other towns of Judea, while Philip had preached the gospel in Samaria, Peter and John had visited them, had preached the gospel in many villages of the Samaritans, and returned to Jerusalem. The conversion of the eunuch, which happened in the same interval, seems to have followed one of the main festivals. And hence, if the date proposed for the death of Stephen, the early summer of A.D. 36, be accurate, the journey to Damascus could not well be earlier than the following spring.

Now St. Paul, in his defence at Jerusalem, seems to refer to the very high priest, who gave him the commission to Damascus, as present, and still alive. Jonathan, however, who was deposed at the Passover, A.D. 37, had been slain at the time of that address, or else Ananias could not have held the office. Hence it is probable that the commission was given by Theophilus, the next high priest; and consequently after the Passover, and before the Pentecost, A.D. 37. On this view, the public ministry of St. Paul would probably begin about the time of Pentecost, or exactly seven years after the first preaching of St. Peter at Jerusalem.

The return of St. Paul to that city took place after three years (Gal. i. 18), and the form of the phrase (*μετὰ ἔτη τρία*) more naturally implies that these years were complete. And since we find that two other visits, as well as the first beginning of the gospel, were at the Feast of Pentecost, this return may be assigned to that festival, A.D. 40. The escape from Damascus would either be a little before, or if it preceded the journey into Arabia, one or two years earlier.

It is usually assumed that the escape from Damascus, Acts ix. 23-25, was at the close of the three years mentioned

in Galatians, and immediately before the visit to Jerusalem. This, however, is by no means clear. The apostle may have continued preaching at Damascus till this conspiracy was formed against him, and on his escape have retired into Arabia, and after a stay of one or two years. have returned to Damascus; and then have left it finally, not so much from immediate persecution, as for the sake of intercourse with Peter, his brother apostle. On one view the escape from Damascus would be at the close of the three years, on the other about midway in their course; and it seems difficult to decide, from the Acts and Epistle, which arrangement is to be preferred.

Now we are told (2 Cor. xi. 32, 33) that when St. Paul escaped from Damascus, the ethnarch of Aretas the king guarded the city gates, desirous to apprehend him. Since Damascus was usually under the Roman government, the question arises, when it was that Aretas held such a jurisdiction over it. Mr. Browne conceives, indeed, that this mention of the ethnarch does not imply an actual government of Aretas. But it is hard to see on what ground such a doubt can be raised. Why should the apostle mention the ethnarch of Aretas, unless to signify that the authorities who then governed the city were arrayed against him? The guarding of the city gates, in this formal manner, would certainly require the assent of the actual governor. It must be clear from the passage that Aretas, and not the Roman president of Syria, actually held the supreme authority.

Dr. Burton, again, thinks it probable that Aretas was at war with Rome in the year A.D. 33, and might then have gained possession of Damascus. But this view is opposed to the testimony of Josephus.¹ After the defeat of Herod, he tells us that Tiberius sent orders to Vitellius to make war upon Aretas. This war, therefore, had not begun before. Vitellius was on his march in consequence of this order, and had reached Jerusalem at the time of the emperor's death. Josephus tells us that the diviners of Aretas en-

¹ "Ant.," xviii. 5.

couraged him not to fear the invasion, because either the emperor or the general would die before it began. On the news of this death, Vitellius abandoned the expedition. Hence the defeat of Herod, at the earliest, would be late in A.D. 35, and the war only determined on in the close of A.D. 36, after the deposition of Pilate, and the former visit of the president to Jerusalem.

Professor Hug conceives that this retreat of Vitellius was the very occasion on which Aretas was encouraged to seize upon Damascus. Caius, however, he observes, disposed the affairs of Arabia before the end of his second year, when he gave a king to the Iturean Arabs, and severed other parts from Arabia. Aretas, therefore, could have held Damascus only from the accession of Caligula to the end of his second year. The Professor refers the flight of Saul to the middle of this period, or about Pentecost A.D. 38, and places his conversion three years earlier.

Mr. Greswell, again, observes that the tetrarchy of Lysanias, of which Damascus was a part, was conferred on Agrippa by Claudius in the first year of his reign. He thinks it probable that the tetrarch had not been long dead, and that Damascus would not have fallen into other hands while the tetrarch was alive; and hence, that the last year of Caius is the one in which we have the strongest assurance that it was subject to Aretas. In this year he places the flight of Saul, and his visit to Jerusalem.

This view, it is evident, rests on a mere conjecture, since Josephus gives no account of the time when Lysanias died. He tells us, in one place, that Caius, on his accession, gave Herod Agrippa the tetrarchy of Lysanias, as well as of Philip; and in another place, that it was added by Claudius on his accession. Hence it seems not unlikely that it was only promised by Caius, and was actually received at the latter date, having been recovered, perhaps, towards the close of Caligula's reign. And hence it is not easy to define the jurisdiction of Aretas over the city by a narrower limit than the first and last years of that emperor, or A.D. 37-40. Hence, whether the flight of St. Paul from Damascus were at the close of three years from his conversion, or

half-way in their course, it appears to satisfy this criterion, unless our knowledge of the history of Damascus were more exact. On the other hand, if his conversion were dated earlier than the summer of A.D. 34, his flight would be too early, so far as we can form a probable judgment, for the jurisdiction of Aretas to have begun.

When the apostle had left for Tarsus, we are told that the Church had rest (ἔιχεν εἰρήνην, Acts ix. 31) throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria. The conversion of Saul alone would not account for this pause in the Jewish persecution, but it is fully explained by another concurrent event, in the attempt of Caligula to set up his statue in the temple at Jerusalem.

The time of this event may be clearly deduced from the "Antiquities." After the deposition of Herod Antipas, which took place in the latter half of A.D. 39, the writer tells us that Caius managed affairs with moderation in the two first years of his reign, but afterwards began to claim Divine honours.¹ In the next chapter he recounts his impiety, and the hazard of the Jews. First came the embassy from Alexandria, then the mission of Petronius, with orders to invade Judea, and erect the statue. He wintered at Ptolemais, proposing to commence the war in the spring. Then followed the petitions of the Jews, the march of Petronius to Tiberias, and their renewed petition for forty days, which Josephus places in the seed-time, but Philo, when the corn was ripe. Petronius, upon this, consented to write to the emperor, and there followed abundant showers of rain. Soon after, the first letter of the emperor arrived, yielding to Agrippa's request, and then the second, which threatened Petronius with death; but the vessel was outsailed by another, which brought the tidings of the death of Caligula. This took place January, A.D. 41. It is therefore clear that the winter passed at Ptolemais was the one of A.D. 39-40, and that the matter was in suspense throughout the whole of the following year. Consequently, if St. Paul visited Jerusalem, and sailed away to Tarsus,

¹ "Ant.," xviii. 7. 8.

as we have inferred above, about the Passover or Pentecost of A.D. 40, it would be at the very time that Petronius and his forces were at Ptolemais, or Tiberias, when the consternation of the Jews was at its height; and hence the pause in the persecution of the Christians, at this period of the sacred history, is fully explained. We have also, conversely, a further presumption that the visit in question really belonged to one of the years A.D. 39, 40, and consequently that the conversion of the apostle should be referred either to A.D. 36 or A.D. 37.

VII. The next question to be examined is the comparative length of the two intervals between the first and second, and the second and third visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem. The whole interval, according to Dr. Burton's construction of the passage in Galatians, would be thirteen, but on the view here preferred, ten complete years. Two years only are assigned by him to the second interval, and eleven to the stay at Tarsus and Antioch, a most unnatural disparity, which does violence to the tenor of the whole history. Let us examine the details in order.

The disposition of the whole period, proposed by Dr. Burton, is as follows. The first visit, A.D. 33; nine years in retirement at Tarsus; the return to Antioch, A.D. 42; the second visit, March, A.D. 44; the first missionary journey, May, A.D. 45; one day to Seleucia, two to Cyprus, a week in the island, two sabbaths at Antioch, or perhaps three weeks or a month; two days to Iconium, a stay there of one week; three weeks at Lystra and Derbe, and about three weeks on their return, so as to reach Antioch by the end of September. They stayed there "no short time," that is, they spent the winter there, and the next Easter attended the council at Jerusalem.

It is difficult to conceive how any reader of the history could arrive at a conclusion so unnatural, with regard to the relative length of the earlier and later portions of this main period. The words of xi. 26 ought alone to suffice for its refutation. How could the writer speak with emphasis of this interval as a whole year, if he had just passed by no less than nine years of St. Paul's labours at

Arrangement of the chronology of the fourteen years, Gal. ii. 1. The second visit to Jerusalem probably seven years from Saul's conversion.

Tarsus without one word of notice ? There are certainly as few traces of a long interval in Acts x. xi., as in xiii. xiv. ; for the whole history of Cornelius, and the conference that followed, must have occupied a few weeks only. Any impartial reader would be disposed to regard the two intervals, from the internal marks alone, as of nearly equal length, and would probably conjecture the first of them to be the shorter. Yet the chronology of Dr. Burton extends the former to eleven, and contracts the latter to less than two years.

Let us now compare the words of the narrative. "They who were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to Jews only" (Acts xi. 19, 20). Some of them, however, Cyprian and Cyrenean Jews, "when they came to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus." Many believed and turned to the Lord. The report of their conversion reached the Church at Jerusalem, who sent Barnabas on a mission of inquiry. On his arrival, he rejoiced at the grace of God, and presently departed to Tarsus, that he might bring Saul to be his helper in the work. "And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch" (Acts xi. 26).

On the scheme of Dr. Burton, eleven years must have elapsed between the latest date of the above dispersion on the death of Stephen, and the journey of Barnabas, to bring Saul to Antioch. Such an interval is tenfold more unnatural than the one against which he has argued, of three or four years being spent in the first missionary circuit. A stay at Tarsus, even of four years, and much more of nine, is too long to suit the character of St. Paul, or to agree with the evident connection, in the history, between the persecution at the death of Stephen and the arrival of Barnabas at Antioch. Accepting the shorter interval of ten years from the first to the third visit, a division into four and six years before and after the death of Herod seems to agree best with the natural proportion of the

sacred narrative. Seven years complete will then intervene between the conversion of Saul and the visit with Barnabas (Acts xi.) ; which leaves a space quite as long as seems quite compatible with the above statement, between the death of Stephen and the first origin of the Gentile Church at Antioch.

The arrangement thus obtained appears to be natural and consistent. The voyage of Saul to Tarsus would be probably about Pentecost, A.D. 40. That year was one of alarm to the Jews from the madness of Caligula, and of consequent rest to the churches, during which Peter carried on his pastoral visitation in Judea. The winter was spent in Joppa, and the next spring, probably, would be the date of his mission to Cornelius. The discussion at Jerusalem, which follows, would thus be in the first half of A.D. 41. The same summer the preaching to the Gentiles at Antioch might begin. The tidings might reach the Church at Jerusalem early in the next spring, when Barnabas would be sent at once on his mission to them. It is unlikely that he would delay long in seeking the help of Saul, who might thus arrive at Antioch about the Pentecost of A.D. 42, after an absence in Cilicia of two years, spent partly in Tarsus, and partly in preaching throughout the whole province (Gal. i. 21). Then a stay of a whole year is specified in Antioch alone. Before its close, or in the spring of A.D. 43, the prophets came down from Jerusalem, and gave warning of the famine then at hand. The collection, we may infer from later examples, would not be the work of a day, but the result of weekly offerings, continued through nearly a whole year, and thus would be ready against the Passover of A.D. 44, when the visit took place, and the famine really began. In this arrangement all the details harmonize well together, and the only difficulty is the length of time from Stephen's death to the rise of the Gentile Church at Antioch. That five years might really elapse is however quite explicable, while a protraction of the interval to more than twice that length, as in Dr. Burton's chronology, involves a thorough dislocation of the whole connection of events pointed out in the narrative.

The contraction of the missionary circuit (Acts xiii., xiv.) to four months only, is equally incredible, and contradicts evident marks in the narrative of repeated and prolonged delay. To assign only one week to the stay in Cyprus is the first departure from the text. For we are told that, "when they were in Salamis, they preached (κατήγγελλον) the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews" (Acts xiii. 5), which clearly implies a stay of several weeks in that one city alone. We are next informed that they went through the island as far as Paphos; which cannot denote a simple journey from one town to the other, but a full proclamation of the gospel in the intermediate places, until at length they arrived at the latter city, when perhaps the lateness of the season might lead them to cross over to the continent before the winter set in. Hence it is tolerably clear that the first summer, and perhaps part of the autumn, was spent in the island. It is not likely that they would omit to preach the gospel in Perga, on their arrival, or that John would leave them there, and return to Jerusalem, unless they had made some stay in the place, before proceeding further. They "went through" (Acts xiii. 14) (διελθόντες),¹ the country from Perga, an expression which St. Luke has used five times in the later chapters for a missionary circuit, and never for a mere journey without stopping, for which another term is employed (Acts xvii. 1, διοδύσαντες). Hence we may safely infer that its meaning here is the same, and that some weeks, perhaps months, were passed on their way to Antioch from Perga. Two Sabbaths at Antioch are specified, before their expulsion, and a longer interval is clearly implied, since the word of God was published throughout all the region. Two months, instead of three weeks, is only a reasonable allowance for their stay. At Iconium, their next missionary station, we are told that they abode a long time, speaking boldly in the Lord; and this, as it clearly denotes a period considerably longer than the stay at Antioch, may be reckoned at four or five months. If their journey began at Pentecost, and they

¹ Acts xiv. 24; xvi. 6; xix. 1, 21; xx. 2.

sailed from Cyprus at the close of September, they might reach Antioch a month later, remove to Iconium about the end of the year, and continue there till the following Passover or Pentecost. They next fled to Lystra and Derbe, and the region round about, and there "they continued preaching the gospel" (*ἦσαν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*). Their labours here might very possibly employ them till the close of the summer. On their return they stayed at each place, to confirm the disciples, and appointed elders in every church, a work that called for deliberation, passed throughout Pisidia, and preached in Perga and Attalia, before they embarked for Antioch. Hence their return could not well be earlier than the spring, and might probably be delayed until the autumn, of the third year.

Now since the return from Jerusalem, A.D. 44, was about the time of Pentecost, it is not probable that the apostles would be sent out on a fresh journey immediately on their arrival at Antioch; and there is nothing in the passage to oppose the construction that their circuit began in the following year. In this case, it might close in the spring or autumn of A.D. 47. After this they abode at Antioch "no little time" before the council. To refer the expression to one single winter, considering that the history occupies at least fifteen, and probably more than twenty years, up to the time of the council, of which one year only is expressly mentioned, is certainly a strained and unnatural estimate. The whole interval, from the first to the third visit, is at least ten years, occupied by the conversion of Cornelius, the spread of the gospel to Antioch, the stay there of one year, the time of the collection, and the visit, the delay before the circuit, and the circuit itself, and lastly this delay at its close, which alone is stated to be "no little time." The term must naturally denote more than a whole year. And hence the interval from the autumn of A.D. 47 to the spring of A.D. 50, agrees well with the tenor of the history. There is nothing whatever in the text to justify the assertion that the visit, Acts xv., "certainly took place in the year after their first tour," for the words tend to the very opposite conclusion. A stay of one winter only, after

such a circuit, would have been no warrant for the emphatic statement of the historian, which, when compared with their previous absence, and their first residence at Antioch, can hardly denote less than two years' delay.

Results so far,
and further
evidence for
fixing the date
of the council.

VIII. The previous reasoning leads us to date the council six complete, or seven current years, after the second visit to Jerusalem, which is fixed to the Passover, A.D. 44, by the testimony of Josephus on the reign of Herod. This conclusion depends on a combination of several data, the most probable view of the period in Galatians, the presumptive date of Stephen's death and Saul's conversion, the occasion of the churches' rest from persecution under Caligula, and the most reasonable distribution of the time between the stay at Tarsus, the length of the first circuit, and the long abode at Antioch after its close. If we abandon the evidence arising from the death of Stephen and the rest of the churches, we might prolong the joint stay at Tarsus and Antioch before the second visit, and diminish the joint length of the circuit and the later residence, possibly two years. Beyond this limit the disproportion becomes too great to have the least plausibility, and the circuit and long stay at Antioch would be contracted into a space too narrow to satisfy the scope of the history. On the other hand, it is possible to defer the council one or two years later, if we suppose the fourteen years to be complete, not current, and the stay at Tarsus and Antioch three years only before the second visit. And thus any year from A.D. 48 to A.D. 51 might possibly be reconciled with the evidence hitherto adduced, though A.D. 49 or A.D. 50 are the dates which will suit best with the whole narrative.

To remove, if possible, this uncertainty, we have next to examine the succession of the Roman procurators, and especially the appointment and recall of Felix. The history connects the latter event with the council by marks of time which hardly admit of greater uncertainty than a single year.¹ It is clear that St. Paul sailed to Rome the same year that Felix was recalled, and reached it in the

¹ Thus Dr. Burton places them in A.D. 46 and 55, Mr. Greswell in A.D. 48 and 58, and Usher and Hug in A.D. 52 and 60.

following spring, and that his release was not until two full years later. And hence the succession of the procurators, if their time can be exactly determined, will nearly fix the chronology, and confirm or modify the date of the council, as provisionally derived from the passage in Galatians and the outline of the previous history. Subsidiary marks of time are found in the decree of Claudius for the expulsion of the Jews from Rome, the appointment of Gallio, the appearance of the Egyptian, the high-priesthood of Jonathan and Ananias, and the pretorian prefects of Rome. The date of the appointment of Felix has first to be ascertained.

IX. After the death of Herod Agrippa there were three governors before Felix,—Cuspius Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, and Cumanus. The first must have arrived in the summer after Herod's death, or A.D. 44. After mention of the famine, which took place during his administration and that of Alexander, Josephus continues: "But now Herod, king of Chalcis, removed Joseph, son of Camydus, from the high-priesthood, and made Ananias, son of Nebedus, his successor. And now Cumanus came as successor to Alexander, as also Herod, brother of Agrippa, departed this life, in the eighth year of Claudius Cæsar, who bestowed his dominions on the younger Agrippa" ("Ant.," xx. 5. 2). Then, after mention of the tumults under Cumanus: "So Claudius sent Felix, the brother of Pallas, to take charge of Judea, and having already completed the twelfth year of his reign, he bestowed on Agrippa the tetrarchy of Philip, and Batanea, and added Trachonitis with Abila, the district of Lysanias; but took from him Chalcis, when he had governed four years" ("Ant.," xx. 7. 1).

Date of appointment of Felix as Procurator of Judea.

The accession of Claudius was January, A.D. 41. And hence we may infer from the above statement, as most probable, that Felix was appointed A.D. 52, which was the twelfth of Claudius, and Chalcis taken from Agrippa in the spring of A.D. 53, when the twelfth year had closed. Since he held it four years, he would receive it not before the spring of A.D. 49. Herod, however, died in the eighth of Claudius, or A.D. 48. This is quite consistent, if the death of Herod were towards the close of that year, since his

nephew could not then be appointed until the following spring. Cumanus, it appears from Josephus, was governor of Judea a little before Herod's death, and his arrival may therefore be placed about midsummer A.D. 48. Now the arrival of Fadus was just four years earlier, and hence that of Alexander may be dated midsummer A.D. 46, so that he and Fadus would respectively hold their office for two full years.

On this view the government of Cumanus would occupy four years, from midsummer A.D. 48 to A.D. 52. This inference is certain with regard to his appointment, but not as to the time of his removal, which might possibly have been earlier. Yet the mention of the appointment of Felix and of the younger Agrippa in the same sentence, with only the completion of the twelfth of Claudius interposed, renders this construction much the most natural. At the least, since two Passovers are mentioned by Josephus during the time of Cumanus, the earliest date of the former is A.D. 49, of the later A.D. 50, and of his removal, the summer of this latter year, while a date two years later seems, from the words of Josephus, to be more probable.

Tacitus, again, mentions the appointment of Felix under the consuls Sulla and Otho in A.D. 52, but in terms not very easy to reconcile with Josephus.

"His brother Felix, however, did not act with equal moderation, having been some time before (*jampridem*) appointed over Judea, and thinking all his crimes secure of impunity, since he had such influence to sustain him. The Jews indeed had risen in a kind of tumult and sedition, even after they had refused to obey, on hearing of the death of Caius; they continued to fear lest some other emperor should give the same commands. Meanwhile Felix inflamed their tumults by unsuitable remedies; Ventidius Cumanus being his rival in the worst deeds, to whom part of the province was given; so that the Galileans were under him, the Samaritans under Felix, nations long at variance, and whose passions were then less restrained through their contempt for their rulers. Hence they began to plunder

each other, to form bands of robbers, to lay ambushes, and at length to hold battles, and bring the spoil to the procurators. These at first rejoiced, but as the evil increased, when they interposed with troops, the soldiers were slain, and the province would have burst into open war, if Quadratus had not stepped in. He did not hesitate long in punishing with death those Jews who had slain the soldiers. Cumanus and Felix caused some delay, since Claudius, on hearing the causes of the rebellion, gave him authority to punish the procurators also. But Quadratus displayed Felix among the judges, receiving him upon the tribunal, that the zeal of his accusers might be cooled. Cumanus was thus condemned for the crimes of which both were guilty, and quiet was restored to the province" (Tac. "Ann.," xii. 21).

Josephus gives no hint of this divided government, shared by Felix with Cumanus, still less, that the former was ever appointed separately over Samaria, and he represents the cause to have been decided by Claudius himself at Rome. Yet since he states that Felix was appointed through the solicitation of the high-priest Jonathan, this may perhaps imply that he had previously held some office in Palestine, and was known in Judea. The statement of St. Paul, that he had been many years a judge to the Jewish nation, leans to the same view. On the other hand, since Cumanus favoured the Samaritans, and the cause was decided against them, it is hard to believe that Tacitus was correctly informed as to their respective provinces, and the true nature of the dispute. Josephus, a native of the country, who was about fourteen years old at the time of the occurrence, is clearly a better authority than Tacitus; while even from the latter we may infer that the removal of Cumanus, and the sole procuratorship of Felix, took place in the year of Sulla and Otho, or in A.D. 52, where Josephus places that appointment.

Four Passovers, on this view, would occur during the government of Cumanus. The tumult, though it might possibly be at the first, seems most naturally referred to the second, or A.D. 50. In either case, it is about the date

assigned to the council by the previous evidence. And hence the slaughter of the Jews, and the troubles of Judea at that Passover, may account for the influx of Christian Jews to Antioch from Jerusalem, which led soon after to the apostle's visit. If this connection be admitted, the council could not well be earlier than midsummer A.D. 49, nor later than the autumn of A.D. 50.

Date of the
removal of
Felix from his
government.

X. From the appointment of Felix, let us proceed to examine the date of his removal, which Professor Hug fixes as late as A.D. 61, but Dr. Burton, following Scaliger, as early as A.D. 55. Since both appeal to the authority of Josephus, it is needful to examine accurately the whole testimony of that historian.

The reasons alleged for each date are briefly these. Josephus tells us that Felix, after his recall, owed his escape to the intercession of Pallas, who was in particular favour with Nero at the time ("Ant.," xx. 8. 9). But Tacitus informs us that Pallas lost the favour of Nero in his first, and was put to death in his eighth year (Tac. "Ann.," xiii. 14; xiv. 65). Hence Dr. Burton has inferred that A.D. 55 is the latest possible date which the histories of Josephus and Tacitus will allow; and, reckoning backward from this year as a fixed point, he obtains A.D. 46 for the date of the council. On the other hand, Professor Hug infers, from the "Life of Josephus," that the recall was in the seventh of Nero, or A.D. 61 ("Life of Jos.," sec. 3), since eight years and four months of Nero's reign were complete before the voyage of Josephus to obtain the liberation of the priests whom Felix had sent prisoners to Rome; and this commission could not be delayed, as on the other hypothesis, seven or eight years after the procurator had been recalled. To decide between these opinions we must take a fuller view of the whole evidence.

After the appointment of Felix, Josephus records in succession the following events, which are a summary of this part of the "Antiquities": the appointment of the younger Agrippa over Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abila, and his removal from Chalcis, after a four years' rule, and the completion of the twelfth of Claudius; the marriage of Drusilla,

Herod Agrippa's daughter, who was six years old at his death, with Azizus, king of Emesa, and her later marriage with Felix, while he was procurator; the death of Claudius and accession of Nero; the death of Azizus, and succession of Soemus, in Nero's first year, with the gift to Agrippa of Tiberias and some parts of Galilee; the growing troubles of Judea, where Felix caught and destroyed many robbers, and Eleazar, one of the most notorious; the assassination of Jonathan the high priest, at the instigation of Felix himself; the crimes and insolence of the Sicarii; the appearance of the Egyptian false prophet, and the dispersion of his followers; the seditions of Cæsarea; the appointment of Ishmael to be high priest, and the disorders of the whole priesthood; the coming of Porcius Festus as the successor of Felix, the accusations of the Jews against him, and his escape through the intercession of his brother Pallas; the decree pronounced by Burrhus against the Jews of Cæsarea; the increase of the Sicarii, and the activity of Festus against them; the petition about the palace of Herod, granted through Poppæa, Nero's wife, and the transfer of the priesthood to Joseph Cabi; the appointment of Albinus, when Nero heard of the death of Festus; the transfer of the priesthood to Ananus, son of Ananus, and the condemnation of James the Just; the deposition of Ananus, after only three months, on the arrival of Albinus, and the appointment of Jesus, son of Damneus; the boldness and crimes of the Sicarii, the enlargement by Agrippa of Cæsarea Philippi, which he calls Neronias; the priesthood of Jesus, son of Gamaliel; the voyage of Florus from Rome, the finishing of the temple, and the transfer of the priesthood to Matthias, son of Theophilus.

In the "Life of Josephus" we are further told that he was born in the first of Caius, that in his twenty-sixth year (*i.e.*, A.D. 63) he took a voyage to Rome, in order to procure the liberation of certain priests, his own acquaintance, whom Felix, when governor, had sent prisoners on a trivial charge, and that he succeeded through the intercession of Poppæa, the wife of Nero. Also at the close of the "Antiquities" we are told that his fifty-sixth year was

then current, in the thirteenth of Domitian ("Ant.," xx. 11. 3).

The accession of Caius (Caligula) was March 16, A.D. 37, and that of Domitian September 13, A.D. 81. Since Josephus was less than fifty-six years old at the beginning of Domitian's thirteenth year, or September 13, A.D. 93, he must have been born later than September 13, A.D. 37, and before March 13, A.D. 38, the close of the first year of Caligula. His birth must therefore be placed about December, A.D. 37, and the time of his voyage, in his twenty-sixth year, was the spring or summer of A.D. 63, the ninth of Nero, and not the previous year.

Hence one evident presumption results against the earlier date for the recall of Felix. In that case the priests must have been detained more than eight years at Rome before Josephus undertook the voyage for their liberation, an interval very unlikely to have occurred.

We have a more decisive proof in the age of Drusilla. Josephus states that she was six years old at the death of her father, Herod Agrippa, that is, in A.D. 44 ("Ant.," xx. 7. 1, 2; 8. 4). After the twelfth of Claudius her brother Agrippa gave her in marriage to Azizus. Not long after, Felix prevailed on her to forsake her husband and to become his own wife. Now, by the express words of Josephus, the appointment of Agrippa over the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanius was later than January, A.D. 53. The first marriage of Drusilla was later than this appointment, and some interval, probably half a year at least, must be allowed before she forsook Azizus and became the wife of Felix. Indeed she would be only fifteen years old in the year A.D. 53. And hence the scheme of Dr. Burton, which places the visit of Paul to Jerusalem in that year, is disproved by this one test alone. At the Pentecost of that year most probably her marriage was not complete, and it is not likely that St. Luke would call her simply the wife of Felix, when she was only living in adultery, and had just before forsaken her lawful husband. We may infer that the visit was not before the death of Azizus, which itself took place in Nero's first year, and hence that the

Pentecost of A.D. 55 is its earliest possible date, and A.D. 57 the earliest year for the recall of Felix.

Again, if we adhere to the order of Josephus, the death of Jonathan the high priest was not earlier than the first of Nero. The appearance of the Egyptian was still later, and A.D. 56 seems the earliest date that we assign to that disturbance. The words of the chief captain, Acts xxi. 38, imply that some time had then elapsed since his appearance. And hence, on this ground, A.D. 56 is the earliest date for the visit, and A.D. 58, in like manner, the earliest year for the governor's recall.

Again, if we place that recall in A.D. 60, we have still a reasonable space for his successor, Festus. For Albinus seems to have held office during four years previous to the war, or A.D. 62-66. Now Festus was not recalled, but his successor was appointed because of his unexpected death. And since both Fadus and Alexander were recalled after two years, it is more natural to assign the same interval, than a longer space, for Festus also.

Further, in A.D. 58 Felix would have been procurator six years, and if the statement of Tacitus has a partial truth, he had held some office in Palestine since the first year of Cumanus, A.D. 48, or for the total space of ten years. This agrees with the words of St. Paul, that he had been for many years a judge to that nation. But in A.D. 53, the date of the visit in Dr. Burton's and Scaliger's chronology, he would have been procurator only one or two years, and only the fifth year would be current from the arrival of Cumanus, his predecessor in office. This note of time is equally conclusive in favour of a considerably later date.

In these remarks it has been assumed that two years elapsed between the visit of St. Paul and the recall of Felix, which results from the usual and natural construction of Acts xxiv. 27. Some, however, have supposed that these two years relate, not to the time of St. Paul's imprisonment, but only to the government of Felix, reckoned either from its origin, or from some renewal, until his recall. But it is very unlikely that St. Luke should adopt so vague an expression, and date from an event nowhere specified in his history.

If referred to the first appointment of Felix, the words would openly contradict those of St. Paul, in the beginning of the same chapter, where he states his government to have lasted many years, and not for two only. On the other hand, to date from some unknown renewal of his office would be in every way most unnatural. And besides, a simple comparison of verses 10, 27, will prove clearly that the historian was not referring, in any sense, to the length of Felix's government, but simply to the long delay before the cause of the apostle came to a real decision. And though we have no letters of St. Paul that can be referred to this period, this is no proof that the two years at Cæsarea were barren in labours. No town was so well suited for intercourse with converted Jews from all the countries of the dispersion, and consequently with all the Christian churches, while Jews formed their nucleus in almost every city; for Cæsarea, it is well known, was the main seaport of Palestine, and the principal seat of the Roman power in that province.

Two reasons alleged for the earlier date of the recall of Felix have still to be examined. He was accused by the Jews at Rome immediately on his return, and spared only by the entreaties of Pallas, who, according to Josephus, was then in favour with Nero. Now Tacitus affirms that the favourite was removed by Nero in his first year, or A.D. 55, whence Dr. Burton infers that this year is the latest date for the recall of Felix, consistent with the testimony of Tacitus and Josephus.

This argument, though such reliance has been placed upon it as to make it the main pillar of the whole chronology, has no weight whatever, and depends for its seeming force on a careless perusal of these two testimonies, and an inaccurate calculation of the times (Tac. "Ann.," xiii. 14). The removal of which Tacitus speaks was not only in the first year of Nero, but earlier than the birthday of Britannicus, which we know from clear evidence was in February. And hence, if the recall of Felix were in the summer of that year, where Dr. Burton and Scaliger have placed it, instead of being in the time when Pallas was highest in power, it

would be in the first crisis of his dishonour and public disgrace. A date a few years later would thus be more probable, even on this ground. After the death of Agrippina, Nero might perhaps be less jealous of the favourite, who had then lived some years in retirement, and to whom he really owed his own elevation to the throne. It is true that Pallas died in the eighth of Nero, and the emperor was suspected of poisoning him (Tac. "Ann.," xiv. 65). But the only reason assigned is Nero's avarice, because, by living to such an age, his former favourite detained from him an immense property. This is quite consistent with the supposition that he had influence enough with Nero, two years before, to obtain the pardon of Felix against a people so despised as the Jews. The favour of the tyrant was eminently capricious; and, with regard to Pallas, would be likely to experience several fluctuations. In fact, the confirmation of Felix in his government by Nero, which Josephus expressly mentions, could not be earlier than January or February A.D. 55, the very time at which Tacitus places the removal of Pallas. Hence it is perfectly clear that the time of his influence, to which Josephus alludes, could not possibly be the same which Dr. Burton has assumed it to be, and must refer to some later period of partially recovered favour, which might be only two years before his death.

Another argument for the earlier date has been stated as follows. The deputies who accused Felix after his recall bribed Burrhus also to procure the decree against the Jews of Cæsarea. Now Burrhus died in A.D. 62, and declined in favour after A.D. 55, and hence it is inferred that the recall of Felix could not be at the later, but might be at the earlier date. But this rests upon a manifest error, for the deputation was not the same. It was the Greeks of Cæsarea, who had been sent to Rome by Felix before his recall, who are said to have bribed Burrhus, and thus procured the decree against the Jews; while the other deputation was actually composed of Jews, and only set out to Rome after Felix had returned ("Ant.," xx. 8. 9). And besides, Burrhus remained in full possession of influence until near

the time of his death, and hence the date A.D. 60 is fully consistent with the facts relative to the embassy from Cæsarea.

The reasons, then, for placing the recall of Felix in A.D. 60, instead of five years earlier, are as follows. First, we avoid the hypothesis, in itself highly improbable, that St. Paul stayed at Tarsus eight or nine years, in comparative inaction, before he began his mission to the Gentiles. Next, the council is thus referred to A.D. 50, and the troubles in Judea at the previous Passover will account for an unusual resort of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem to Antioch. Thirdly, the visit of St. Paul is thus placed three years after the death of Drusilla's first husband, instead of being, as with the other date, a few months before the probable time of her first marriage, and two years before her union with Felix ceased to be adulterous, while her age will thus be twenty instead of only fifteen years. Fourthly, Felix would then have been procurator eight years, and if Tacitus be correct, have held some office in Palestine four years longer, which agrees with the statement of the apostle, that he had been many years a judge to that nation. On the other view, little more than one year would have passed from the recall of Cumanus, his predecessor, and less than five years from that predecessor's first appointment. This objection, like the third, is quite fatal to the earlier dates, even when standing alone. Fifthly, two years instead of seven are thus allowed for the government of Festus, which agrees with the fact that he was not recalled, but died unexpectedly. Sixthly, there is thus an interval of three years, instead of eight, between the voyage of the priests sent by Felix to Rome, and that of Josephus to procure their liberation, an interval far more consistent with probability. Seventhly, it agrees with the statement of Josephus, that Nero, in his first year, confirmed Felix in his government. To suppose him recalled in that very year is therefore a flat contradiction to the testimony of the historian. Lastly, it maintains the natural order of time in these chapters of Josephus, since all the actions of Felix, except his marriage with Drusilla, are evidently placed by

him under the reign of Nero. If he was governor under Claudius for two years only, and for six under Nero, this order is quite natural, but is irreconcilable with the earlier chronology.

XI. The intermediate dates may now be adjusted, if not with exactness, at least with high probability, and a near approach to the truth. The council, in the fourteenth year from the apostle's conversion, and soon after the troubles had begun under Cumanus in Judea, will be referred to the summer of A.D. 50. The remainder of that year, which would be far advanced on their return to Antioch, might be spent in that city; and the plan of revisiting the churches may be referred naturally to the early spring of A.D. 51, when seven years were nearly complete from the death of Herod, and fourteen from Saul's conversion. One year must have been spent in the circuit of four provinces,—Syria, Cilicia, Phrygia, and Galatia. It would be quite inconsistent with the purpose of the apostle to pursue a very rapid and hasty journey. He went first "throughout Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches," and then throughout Phrygia and the country of Galatia, in the last of which provinces many churches were evidently formed for the first time. He might thus arrive at Troas on the sea-coast early in the spring of A.D. 52. Six months may be allowed for the stay in Macedonia, three months at Philippi, where the stay seems to have been the longest, and about six weeks respectively at Thessalonica and Berea. The apostle would then arrive at Corinth about October A.D. 52, and his stay of eighteen months would terminate about the Passover A.D. 54, when the season would be favourable for his voyage. The feasts, Acts xviii. 21, would be the Pentecost of the same year, so that the interval would allow only a short delay at Ephesus, and that feast was chosen elsewhere for a similar visit, being a natural epoch to the Church after the first Pentecost. The rest of the year would be occupied with the short stay at Jerusalem, the voyage to Antioch, a stay of some time in that city, and a second visit to all the churches of Galilee and Phrygia, and the eastern parts of Asia Minor, so that St. Paul would probably reach Ephesus

Arrangement
of events from
the council to
the release
from Rome.

just at its close. Three months before the separation of the disciples, and two years afterwards, will bring us to the Passover of A.D. 57. At that time, or soon after, the tumult arose, and the apostle left a little before Pentecost, which was the intended limit of his stay (1 Cor. xvi. 8). He stayed in Macedonia until late in the autumn, passed the three winter months in Greece, returned to Macedonia about the beginning of March, and set out from Philippi for Jerusalem immediately after the Passover of A.D. 58, arriving punctually at the time of Pentecost. There he was arrested, and remained a prisoner at Cæsarea for two full years, or till the Pentecost of A.D. 60, which has been fixed already to be the time when Felix was recalled. Towards August he sailed for Rome, but did not arrive till the winter was past, about February or March, A.D. 61; while his release would be two years later, or in A.D. 63, somewhere in the spring. All the dates recorded by the evangelist fall in with this arrangement. The whole history thus disposes itself, without violence, into four portions, each of seven years: from the Pentecost A.D. 30, to the conversion of Saul, about the Pentecost A.D. 37; from his conversion to the return of Paul and Barnabas from Jerusalem, after the death of Herod, Pentecost A.D. 44; thence to the opening of the second missionary circuit, early in A.D. 51; and thence to the arrival at Jerusalem for the last time, at the Pentecost of A.D. 58.

Subsidiary
notes of time.

XII. During this interval, however, there are other notes of time which require to be considered, as they may tend either to weaken or confirm the previous chronology. These are the decree of Claudius, the arrival of Gallio at Corinth, the mention of Narcissus in the Epistle to the Romans, the Egyptian false prophet, the high-priesthood of Ananias, and the pretorian prefects of Rome.

1. The decree
of Claudius.

1. When St. Paul reached Corinth, Aquila and Priscilla had lately arrived from Rome, in consequence of a decree of Claudius, banishing all the Jews from that city (Acts xviii. 2). If there were clear data to fix the time of that decree, it would serve to test the chronology. But we are left to mere conjecture. Mr. Greswell refers it to January, A.D. 50,

and ascribes it to the report at Rome of disturbances in Judea, which rendered it unsafe to leave so many Jews in the capital. Suetonius, however, seems to account for it by local tumults among the Jews at Rome. "*Judæos, impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes, Româ expulit*" (Suet. "*Claud.*," 25).¹ This is most naturally explained of internal dissensions, which followed the introduction of the gospel at Rome. The name, Chrestus, here assigned to the author of the disturbances, seems to imply that they arose among the Jews of the dispersion, in conflicts occasioned by Christianity, and not among the Jews of Palestine. The troubles in Judea seem also to have reached their height a little before the recall of Cumanus, early in A.D. 52, and if the decree were referred to that period, it will be six months before the arrival of St. Paul at Corinth, as determined above. Indeed it is not improbable that this decree first became publicly known during the stay at Philippi, and gave encouragement to that tumultuous outcry—"These men being Jews, do exceedingly trouble our city," which led to the apostle's imprisonment. If the troubles in Judea were at their height in the winter before Cumanus was recalled, or at the close of A.D. 51, and the decree was published in the early spring, and known at Philippi in May, and St. Paul reached Corinth in the following autumn, all the facts will be found in entire harmony one with another.

2. Again, the persecution of the Jews against St. Paul at Corinth reached its height "when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia." The words of St. Luke evidently imply that Gallio was not in office when St. Paul arrived there, and had only been appointed a few months before the close of that long residence. Now Gallio was the brother of Seneca, who was recalled from exile in A.D. 49, and made the tutor of Nero. Hence his appointment cannot reasonably be placed earlier than A.D. 50. If, however, the council had been held, as Dr. Burton supposes, in A.D. 46, the apostle would leave Corinth, at the latest, in the spring

2. The appointment of Gallio.

¹ The Jews, who raised continual riots at the instigation of one Chrestus, he (Claudius) expelled from Rome.

of A.D. 49. Dr. Burton dates his departure in the previous year, when Seneca was certainly an exile; and, consequently, when it is most unlikely that Gallio would have been appointed over Achaia. On the other hand, it was A.D. 53 when Nero married Octavia, and his prospect of succession to the throne was secured by the acts of Agrippina. The time would thus be very natural for the appointment of Gallio, the brother of Nero's tutor, to a lucrative and honourable post. Nero completed his sixteenth year on December 15, A.D. 53, and then married Octavia. The appointment of Gallio may be not improbably referred to that celebration, so that he would enter on his office in January or February, A.D. 54, about three months before the apostle set out from Corinth. It is plain that the harmony with St. Luke's statement, on this view of the dates, will be complete.

3. The household of Narcissus.

3. The salutation (Rom. xvi. 11) to the household of Narcissus has been made a reason for doubting this chronology. The letter, on the arrangement advocated in this work of Dr. Burton, was written about February, A.D. 58, but on the scheme, five years earlier. Now many have supposed this Narcissus to be the celebrated freedman of Claudius. In this case, since he was slain at the very opening of Nero's reign, it is argued that the epistle must have been written earlier. It is, however, a mere conjecture that the freedman of Claudius is the person to whom St. Paul alludes. And even were this conjecture a certain fact, it is surely possible that converts in his family, during his lifetime, might be designated from their former master, even three years after his death. Dr. Burton, indeed, affirms that such a salutation would be impossible, unless during the lifetime of Narcissus, but without reason. If several of the household of that freedman and favourite had become converts while he was alive, no other mode of designation would be equally brief and appropriate, in this brief series of apostolic salutations. But since it is impossible to determine whether the freedman of Claudius, or some other Narcissus is spoken of, the argument can have no weight in a question of exact chronology.

4. When St. Paul visited Jerusalem, the Sicarii were in full activity, and the Egyptian, not long before, had led four thousand of them into the wilderness (Acts xxi. 38). Now Josephus mentions, in order, the accession of Nero, the confirmation of Felix in his office, his exertions in capturing Eleazer and clearing the country of the robbers, the rise of another class of robbers, called Sicarii, the murder of Jonathan, the rise of false prophets ("Ant.," xx. 8. 6): and lastly, the appearance of the Egyptian, who did more mischief than even these, with his overthrow by Felix and the Roman soldiers. Since the confirmation of Felix could not well be earlier than the spring of A.D. 55, the rise of the Sicarii, after the extirpation of other robbers, could hardly be earlier than the following year; and some interval must still be allowed before the appearance of the Egyptian. Hence this tumult may be probably assigned to the close of A.D. 57, or the opening of A.D. 58. This agrees perfectly with the question of Lysias, "Art thou not then that Egyptian, who before these days made an uproar, and led out into the wilderness four thousand men of the Sicarii?" If we adhere to the order of Josephus, the spring A.D. 56 is clearly too early for this event, though either A.D. 57 or 58 would agree well with the history.

4. The date of the Egyptian.

5. At the same visit, Ananias seems to have exercised the function of high priest, and still St. Paul was not aware of his claim to the office. Some have proposed to translate his words—"I know not, brethren, that there is a high priest" (Acts xxiii. 5). But this has no warrant in the Greek idiom, and is clearly disproved by the rest of the verse. St. Paul explains why he had used so sharp a rebuke against Ananias. Now his ignorance that Ananias was high priest would be a direct and simple explanation; while his ignorance of there being any high priest in office could only serve as an excuse, by resolving itself into the more precise affirmation, which our translators have so justly preferred.

5. The priesthood of Ananias.

Now it is clear from Josephus that Ananias was sent to Rome along with Cumanus, and that, after the appointment of Felix, Jonathan held the office till his death. Afterwards the priesthood was vacant, until Agrippa gave it to Ishmael,

the son of Cabi, very shortly before the recall of Felix. The death of Jonathan can hardly be placed earlier than the latter half of A.D. 56, since his long expostulations with Felix on his misgovernment occasioned his murder. The visit, then, if at Pentecost A.D. 58, would be at a time when the office was vacant, and Ananias would not be the real high priest.

6. The prefecture of Burrhus.

6. Finally, when Paul arrived at Rome, the centurion delivered the other prisoners to the prefect.¹ The singular number, used by St. Luke, implies naturally that the office was then held by one, and not by two persons. Now Burrhus died in A.D. 62, with a suspicion of poison, and Fenius Rufus and Sofanius Tigellinus were appointed his joint successors (Tac. "Ann.," xiv. 51). From the account of Tacitus the change would seem to have been early in the year, since the death of Octavia, which is mentioned nine sections later, took place on the ninth of June. Hence it seems certain that A.D. 63, the date of Usher, is too late for the arrival at Rome, and even A.D. 62, the date of Professor Hug, would probably fail to satisfy this condition, while the date proposed above, A.D. 61, passes unharmed through this final test.

A summary of the results obtained.

XIII. The conclusions thus obtained, when they have been combined with the evidence which fixes the epistles to their respective places in the history, will result in the following table, where the months in brackets are only conjectural and approximate.

A.D.		A.D.
30. April.	Crucifixion.	40. (Pentecost.) First Visit to Jerusalem.
May.	Pentecost.	(September.) Peter at Joppa.
36. (June.)	Death of Stephen.	41. (Pentecost.) Conversion of Cornelius.
37. (April.)	Conversion of Saul.	42. (February.) Barnabas at Antioch.
Pentecost.	First Preaching of Saul.	42. (Pentecost.) Saul at Antioch.

¹ ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ (Acts xxviii. 16). Most modern editions omit the words. But Bishop Lightfoot says: "The statement does not look like an arbitrary fiction, and probably contains a genuine tradition, even if it was no part of the original text" ("Ep. to Phil.," p. 7, note 4).

A.D.		A.D.	
43. Passover.	Prophecy of Famine.	May.	Departure from Ephesus.
44. Passover.	Second Visit to Jerusalem.	July.	<i>Second Epistle to Corinth.</i>
May.	Death of Herod.	November.	Arrival at Corinth.
Pentecost.	Return to Antioch.	58. February.	<i>Epistle to the Romans.</i>
45. Pentecost.	First circuit begins.	Passover.	St. Paul at Philippi.
(September.)	Paul and Barnabas at Perga.	Pentecost.	Fifth Visit to Jerusalem.
46.	Circuit in Asia.	60. Pentecost.	Recall of Felix.
47. (September.)	Return to Antioch.	August.	Voyage to Rome.
50. Spring.	Pharisees at Antioch.	November.	Shipwreck at Malta.
Summer.	Council at Jerusalem.	61. February.	Arrival at Rome.
Autumn.	Peter and Mark at Antioch.	62. (July.)	<i>Epistle to the Ephesians.</i>
51. Spring.	Second Circuit begins.		<i>Epistle to the Colossians.</i>
(September.)	St. Paul in Galatia.		<i>Epistle to Philemon.</i>
52. (February.)	St. Paul at Troas.	63. (February.)	<i>Epistle to the Philippians.</i>
(May.)	St. Paul leaves Philippi.	(June.)	<i>Epistle to the Hebrews.</i>
(August.)	St. Paul at Athens.	(August.)	St. Paul in Crete.
October.	St. Paul at Corinth.	Winter.	St. Paul at Colosse.
(November.)	<i>First Epistle to Thessalonica.</i>	64. Spring.	St. Paul in Macedonia.
53. Spring.	<i>Second Epistle.</i>	Autumn.	St. Paul at Corinth.
Autumn. ¹	<i>Epistle to the Galatians.</i>		<i>First Epistle to Timothy.</i>
54. January.	Gallio in Achaia.		<i>Epistle to Titus.</i>
April.	St. Paul sails to Ephesus.	Winter.	St. Paul at Nicopolis.
May.	Fourth Visit to Jerusalem.	65. Spring.	Dalmatia and Troas.
Autumn.	Second Circuit of Galatia.	Summer.	St. Paul prisoner at Rome.
55. January.	St. Paul arrives at Ephesus.		<i>Second Epistle to Timothy.</i>
April.	Separation of Disciples.	66. Spring?	St. Paul's Martyrdom at Rome.
57. April.	<i>First Epistle to Corinth.</i>		

¹ Bishop Lightfoot assigns a later date to this epistle. I think that my father, after the publication of Dr. Lightfoot's commentary, still inclined to the earlier date, although with much less confidence.—ED.

The dates after the close of the history are derived, by probable inference, from the indications in St. Paul's latest epistles, and are given as the most probable. It is possible, however, that the circuit to Colosse from Rome might occupy another year, so as to bring the four last dates a little lower, and the martyrdom might also occur before the winter, on Timothy's arrival, though the passage 2 Tim. iv. 13 leads naturally to an opposite view. Since, however, the persecution of the Christians began soon after the fire at Rome, which took place July A.D. 64, it is probable that the apprehension of St. Paul in Asia was not delayed beyond the following summer, and his martyrdom might possibly occur at the close of the same year.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE AUTHORSHIP AND DATE OF THE BOOK OF ACTS.

THE previous inquiry, besides its direct purpose in fixing the chronology of St. Luke's narrative, lends a powerful confirmation to its authority, from its entire agreement, in a large variety of details, and in a manner the most indirect, with the best contemporary historians. The way is now prepared for an examination of the time when the work was written, and its claim to be an authentic composition of St. Luke.

The author was plainly a companion of St. Paul.

And first it is plain, from the book itself,¹ that it professes to be written by a companion of St. Paul, who was present during his first voyage from Troas and stay at Philippi, and who afterwards accompanied him from Philippi to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to Rome. And since the whole narrative bears every mark of sincerity and exact information, and is invincibly confirmed by its coincidences with St. Paul's letters, we are bound to accept its own evidence on this point as conclusive. The only alternative is that of deliberate forgery, and is too absurd to need further refutation. Some German critics, indeed, have started a middle hypothesis, that the latter part is a journal of Timothy, which the unknown writer of the book, at a later period, inserted without change in his own narrative. But this wild fancy refutes itself on the least attention to the history. For the writer expressly distinguishes himself from Timothy at the beginning of that very journey, since he represents himself to have stayed with Paul at Philippi, while Timothy and others had gone before, to

¹ Acts xvi. 10-13, 40; xx. 6; xxi. 17, 18; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 16.

wait for them at Troas (Acts xx. 4-6). And besides, there is no break in the whole narrative which could give such an hypothesis the least plausibility. For the twentieth chapter is inseparably linked with the tumult at Ephesus, and with the previous account of Paul's ministry in Asia. In the next chapter the allusion to the seven deacons is equally retrospective, and the whole of this closing portion is evidently an integral and essential part of the history. Hence it follows that the writer was a companion of Paul for several years. From comparing the negative and positive evidence of the book itself with the salutations in the epistles, we obtain precisely that result, by their internal testimony, which is the voice of all early tradition, that Luke, the beloved physician, and no other companion of the apostle, was the writer of the work.¹

The internal evidence confirms the voice of all early tradition. The author was St. Luke.

The work not complete till A.D. 63, the second whole year of St. Paul's imprisonment. Probably it was not of later date.

The next inquiry relates to the date of its composition. The last event recorded is the close of Paul's imprisonment, which must be referred, as we have seen, to the year A.D. 63. Hence the last chapter, if not the whole work, could not have an earlier date. But there has been a serious division of judgment, whether the book were written and published about that time, or considerably later. Thus Professor Hug supposes the gospel, and much more the Book of Acts, to have been written after the decease of the apostle. On the other hand, Tholuck and Olshausen, among recent critics, with most of the earlier commentators, refer its composition to the very time of the imprisonment at Rome.

The reasons for this earlier date are simple and manifest. The mere continuance of an imprisonment is by no means the most natural date for the close of the history, supposing that it was written after the apostle's death, or even after he was advanced far on another journey. When the writer, therefore, ends abruptly at this point, without any mention of the circumstances of St. Paul's release, the only simple explanation must be, that he brought the history down to the date of its composition. And this view

¹ Compare "*Horæ Apostolicæ*," pp. 351-353, quoted by Bishop Wordsworth in his "*Introduction to the Acts*."

is confirmed by the nature of all the later chapters, which are simply a personal narrative of the apostle. The account of the voyage and shipwreck bears every sign, from the minuteness and reality of the description, of being written very shortly after the shipwreck itself had occurred. Hence no view can be so natural as that which dates the composition after the arrival at Rome, and during the course of the two years' stay of the apostle.

Again, the last two verses have precisely the appearance of a brief addition, intended simply to bring down the narrative to the time then present. They read as follows, when taken with the previous verse :—

The last two verses a brief supplement.

“ And when he had said these things, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves. *And he remained two full years in a hired house of his own, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him*” (Acts xxviii. 29-31).

There is here just that unfinished air which a narrative assumes when the writer brings it down to the actual time, without caring to select any marked epoch for its conclusion. And hence we may reasonably infer that the two years of imprisonment were just completed, and that the apostle, if not still a prisoner, had only just obtained his release, when the history was brought to its close.

The opinion, which delays the work to a later time, is burdened with an inherent improbability. For since the whole narrative, as it stands, ranges through thirty-three years, and the writer bears the character of an eye-witness in a great part of it, there can be no reason assigned why he should have preferred a long delay, instead of seizing the opportunity for composing it during his sojourn with the apostle at Rome. The latest events would then be fresh in his memory, and the earliest already so remote, that further delay in recording them could answer no purpose. Whatever motive therefore prompted the composition of the work, we should naturally assign to it a date not long after those events which constitute the most graphic

and personal portion of the narrative, and which the writer had witnessed with his own eyes.

The time of the imprisonment afforded opportunity for such a work.

From the epistles it is clear that St. Luke was with the apostle, at least during the main part of his imprisonment. No opportunity could seem better suited for such a work. It is quite in harmony with the general law of Providence, that when the apostle and his companions were debarred from preaching and missionary circuits, the occasion should be seized for another mode of spreading the truth, and for confirming the faith of the disciples by a record of the triumphs the gospel had already gained.

If written later, why no mention of any later event?

If the book were not written at this time, we must place it either after the death of the apostle, or during his second imprisonment, or in the interval during his latest circuit. If it were written after his death, that event would certainly have formed the natural close. If during the second imprisonment, it would be unnatural to specify the manner of the former arrival at Rome, and to say nothing of the later visit, which must have been fresh in the mind of the writer. Even if we place it during the last circuit, the writer could scarcely have avoided speaking of the apostle's liberation, and of his renewed labours after his release.

The description of Gaza, as desert, no argument for later date.

An argument for a later date, after the beginning of the Jewish war, has been drawn from Acts viii. 26. Gaza, as we learn from Josephus ("Bell.," ii. 18. 1), was assaulted and destroyed by the Jews at the beginning of their last troubles, or about A.D. 66, under the government of Florus. The historian is supposed to refer to this recent occurrence when he says, "This is desert" (*αὐτὴ ἐστὶν ἔρημος*).

But this construction of the words is unnatural. They refer evidently to the road, and not to the place. There is no reason why the later desolation of Gaza should be mentioned, and that of Ptolemais passed by in silence, a town also mentioned by the writer, which was destroyed by the Jews at the same time. An intimation of the lonely character of the road would be suitable to the object of the narrative, since the direction would be more clearly supernatural, but an allusion to the later desolation of the town could answer no purpose, and has no parallel in the rest of the

work. And while the phrase is quite appropriate for the character of the road, which would be permanent, it is just as inappropriate to describe a recent change in the state of the town, which would require either the use of the verb, or of an adverb of time, *τὴν νῦν ἡρημωμένην*, or *ἤτις ἡρημώται*. And hence the argument is of no force whatever.

When we examine carefully the narrative of the voyage, and the break which precedes it, and consider the long stay at Cæsarea, it will seem not improbable that all the work, except the two last chapters, was composed at Cæsarea, and only the conclusion added at Rome. No place would certainly be more convenient than Cæsarea for access to the best information on the facts recorded in the earlier part of the history, and the presence of St. Paul would there be as available for the writer's assistance as during the residence at Rome. The completion of the work, however, cannot be placed earlier than the close of two years after the arrival in Italy, while its commencement, at the earliest, must have been some time after the first audience at Cæsarea.

The residence of Theophilus, if it can be clearly ascertained, will throw further light on the circumstances of the publication. His title proves that he was a person of rank, while the preface to the gospel implies that he was already a well-instructed convert to the faith. It is plain that he was not a resident in Palestine, for St. Luke thinks it necessary to characterize Capernaum as a city of Galilee (St. Luke iv. 31), and speaks (ix. 10) of the "city called Bethsaida"; he had not even visited Jerusalem, for three times the evangelist speaks of the Mount, called the Mount of Olives, or Olivet (St. Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37; Acts i. 12), he speaks too of "a village called Emmaus" (St. Luke xxiv. 13), and Arimathæa, "a city of the Jews" (xxiii. 51), in a way that would lead us to suppose that Theophilus was not familiar with these localities. He was not familiar with Athens and its neighbourhood (Acts xvii. 21), nor well acquainted with Macedonia (xvi. 12), while it is plain that he was not a constant resident either at Corinth or Ephesus, at least during the limits of St. Paul's labours. The chief

Perhaps the main part (chap. i.-xxvi.), composed at Cæsarea, 58-60 A.D.

The work is dedicated to Theophilus. Where did he live? (1) Certainly not in Palestine.

alternatives are three: that he resided in Italy, in Greece, or in the neighbourhood of Antioch in Syria.

(2) Possibly in Italy, in Greece, or in the Syrian Antioch.

The first of these opinions has been held by several modern writers, and has in its favour the testimony of Eutychius, a writer, however, only of the tenth century, and therefore of very little weight. Its chief ground is the absence of geographical explanation in the last chapter, where Syracuse, Rhegium, Puteoli, Appii Forum, and Tres Tabernæ are mentioned as lying on the route of the apostle from Melita to Rome. Theophilus, it is argued, if a resident in Italy, would be familiar with Rome and its neighbourhood, and thus the character of this part of the narrative would be explained. But the conclusion will by no means follow; since a provincial of rank, like Theophilus, would probably have had to pay one visit at least to Rome, and in that case the places which are here mentioned would equally have been well known to him. Nay, even without a personal visit, their position would be as likely to be known as the position of Civita Vecchia, of Versailles, or of Dover, to any European of rank in our own day. Indeed the same argument would prove Theophilus to be a resident on the coast of Asia Minor, since Assos, Mitylene, Chios, Samos, Trogyllium and Miletus, Coos, Rhodes and Patara, are equally named without any fuller explanation. A wider collation of the internal evidence is needful, to arrive at any probable decision.

Reasons against the Roman residence.

Several reasons may be urged against the above hypothesis, which makes Theophilus an inhabitant of Rome. Throughout the whole course of the gospel, there are no phrases which imply a reference to Roman, but many to Grecian habits of thought. The political allusions are all Syrian, as in the mention of the presidency of Cyrenius, and the tetrarchy of Abila (St. Luke ii. 2; iii. 1). The Greek inscription on the cross is first mentioned, before the Hebrew and Latin. The Greek and not the Roman coins are introduced, and the Roman expression for tribute, *census*, which appears in the two other gospels, is replaced by the proper Greek term. There is the same entire absence of local explanation in the mention of Phenice, Cyprus, Antioch,

Seleucia, Salamis, Paphos, Cæsarea, Joppa and Tarsus, Iconium, Troas, Coos, Rhodes, Patara, Ptolemais, which there is in the account of the last approach to Rome. And hence there seems a clear preponderance of internal presumptions that Theophilus was a resident of Syria, or Asia Minor, rather than of Italy. The name itself is that of a contemporary Jewish high priest, and is much more likely to have been found among the Gentile proselytes of Syria than among the natives or inhabitants of Rome.

It is objected by Professor Hug, that a native of Antioch could hardly be so ignorant as Theophilus would appear to have been, of the geography of Palestine. But this remark has little foundation. For St. Luke mentions without comment or explanation the three districts of Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene, as well as Judea, Galilee, Samaria, Jericho, Bethany, the city of Samaria, Gaza, Azotus, Joppa, and Cæsarea. An explication appears only in the inland towns and villages, as Capernaum, Bethsaida, Gadara, Nain, Arimathea, Nazareth and Emmaus, which might very well be unknown to the residents of Northern Syria or of Asia Minor.

Professor Hug's objections not conclusive.

Again, it is alleged that the abrupt cessation of the history, after the arrival at Rome, implies that Theophilus was himself present during the apostle's residence in that city. But this is equally explained, if the history were written in the course of that residence, since the time of its composition would impose the same limit as before. And indeed the two last verses seem quite unnatural, if Theophilus were then at Rome, so as to be one of those who resorted to the apostle and received his instructions in the faith of Christ.

The same writer endeavours to account for the structure of the history from the supposed change of the writer's usual residence. He conceives that he was in Palestine until the gospel reached Antioch, and that not long after he removed to Troas, so that the first nine chapters, and the twelve last, were written from direct, the intermediate portion from indirect information. And hence that the book has no regular plan, or unity of idea, but is moulded

simply by the locality of the writer, and his more abundant or more scanty materials. Even Tholuck in part adopts this view, and says that the book is "in one respect unsatisfactory as an historical work, because it wants unity of plan."

This notion, however, will be found on examination to be very erroneous. The history has a perfect unity of plan. It describes in succession all the main stages in the transfer of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles, and from Jerusalem, the holy city of the prophets, to Rome, the metropolis of the Gentile world. A constant, regular progression, is observable in its whole course, from Jerusalem to Judea, from Judea to Samaria, from Samaria to Damascus, Cyprus and Antioch, from Antioch to the whole of Syria and Cilicia, and thence to Phrygia and Galatia, to Macedonia and Achaia, and all the remaining portions of Asia Minor; and finally, after the deliberate resistance and rejection of the gospel at Jerusalem, to Rome itself, which is indicated, as early as the nineteenth chapter, to be the designed terminus of the whole history.

The reasons
for a residence
at Antioch.

Let us now consider more fully the indications, which the narrative contains, that it was probably written, in the first place, for a Gentile proselyte, become a convert to the Christian faith, whose residence was in the neighbourhood of Antioch.

1. His general,
but not minute,
knowledge of
Palestine to-
pography,
customs, and
politics.

1. First, it appears from the previous remarks that Theophilus had a general, but not a minute acquaintance with the geography of Palestine. Districts little known to the Italians, as Iturea, Trachonitis, and Abilene, are mentioned without a word of comment; but it is stated that Capernaum and Nazareth were in Galilee, that Gadara was over against it, on the other side of the lake, that Emmaus was sixty furlongs, and the Mount of Olives a sabbath day's journey, from Jerusalem. The latter expression, with the mention of the second-first sabbath, and of the preparation, would be most natural, if Theophilus were already familiar with the Jewish customs and festivals. The mention, also, of Herod the tetrarch, his brother Philip, and Lysanias, of Herod the king, of king Agrippa and Bernice,

would imply some familiarity, on the part of Theophilus, with the political condition and changes of Palestine which a resident in or near Antioch would naturally possess. It appears also, from comparing Luke xii. 59 and xxi. 2, with Matt. v. 26 and Mark xii. 42, that he was accustomed to the Greek, rather than to the Roman coinage.

2. The first mention of Antioch is in the description of Nicolas, one of the seven deacons, who was a proselyte of that city. There is no reason apparent, on the face of the narrative, why the fact should be specified, since all the other deacons are named without any description. But if Theophilus were also "a proselyte of Antioch," it would be natural to notice the fact that another Gentile proselyte, like himself, and of the same city, had been so early promoted to an honourable office in the mother church of Jerusalem.

2. The special mention of Nicolas among the deacons.

3. The formal mention of the spread of the gospel to Antioch, and the foundation of the church in that city, occurs at the close of Acts xi. It is there introduced by a peculiar phrase of transition, οἱ μὲν οὖν, which the context alone is hardly sufficient to explain. It will be explained, however, if Theophilus was familiar with the fact that the gospel had reached Antioch, and that a flourishing church had been formed, and only needed to have a brief explanation of the circumstances and occasion under which the message first arrived. It is clear that Antioch now becomes the central point of the narrative, until the journey into Europe begins. Yet no discourse in that city is recorded, like those at Jerusalem, at Cæsarea, at the Pisidian Antioch, or still later at Athens. The whole character of the passage agrees with the idea, that Theophilus, as well as St. Luke, knew the city, and the actual state of the church; and that the latter confined himself to a brief explanation of the cause which led to the extension of that church, of the pre-eminence it enjoyed as the birth-place of the Christian name, and the incident which led to the next visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem.

3. The notice of the spread of the gospel to Antioch.

4. There are two other intervals in the history, of which Antioch is the scene, after the return from Jerusalem, and

4. The brevity of reference to

the local church history of Antioch, in the two former visits.

before the next visit to the council. These must have occupied together about four years. Yet not one fact is placed on record with regard to the labours of the apostles, during their stay in that city. After the historian has brought Paul and Barnabas back again to Antioch, he passes all in silence until they leave it for their first circuit; and on their return, he merely observes that they abode there a long time with the disciples. There is in each case a distinct break in the very form of the narrative. Now if Theophilus was familiar with the local history of that church, this silence of the writer receives its simplest explanation. In the whole of this circuit there is every sign that Theophilus was acquainted with the localities of Asia Minor, since no explication occurs in any one instance. For in Acts xiv. 6, the order of the original is different from the received version, and the more correct rendering will be, "and they fled unto the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra, and Derbe, and the neighbourhood." The dialect of Lycaonia, which has exercised the research of modern critics, is also alluded to without any comment, and Iconium and Attalia are mentioned in the same manner. The correct reading ejects the adverb, ἐκεῖ, *there*, from the last verse (Acts xiv. 28), and thus confirms the general impression, that Antioch was the local centre of thought to Theophilus, and was so regarded by the historian.

5. In the short visit (Acts xviii.).

5. Only one other visit of St. Paul to Antioch is recorded in the history, and with the same brevity. After he left Corinth, "having landed at Cæsarea, and gone up and saluted the church, he went down to Antioch. And having spent some time, he went forth, journeying in order over the country of Galatia and Phrygia, strengthening all the disciples" (Acts xviii. 22, 23). The brevity of the account, here also, is very apparent.

6. Theophilus but slightly acquainted with Macedonian towns.

6. The mention of the towns of Greece and Macedonia seems to imply that Theophilus was not familiar with that peninsula, except with the route through Corinth to Rome. Thus Philippi is explained to be "the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony" (Acts xvi. 12; xvii. 1). The fact is stated, as if otherwise not known to Theophilus,

that the synagogue of the Jews was in Thessalonica, not at Philippi, Amphipolis, or Apollonia. On the other hand, Cenchrea, the port of Corinth, is assumed to be known. The upper coasts are also mentioned familiarly, as a well-known phrase for the inland and eastern part of the Asiatic peninsula, and the places on the route from Troas to Cæsarea are put down without further comment. All this agrees well with the idea that the residence of Theophilus was somewhere on that line of coast.

7. Two names are introduced abruptly in the narrative, that of Jason at Philippi, and that of Alexander at Ephesus. "They assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people" (Acts xvii. 5). "And when they had taken security of Jason and of the others, they let them go" (Acts xvii. 9). "And they drew Alexander out to the multitude, the Jews putting him forward" (Acts xix. 33). It is not easy to determine the exact reason of this peculiarity. Of Jason we only know that he was a kinsman of St. Paul, and sent a salutation from Corinth to the Roman Christians (Rom. xv. 21). Hence the manner in which he is introduced is quite consistent with the view which makes Theophilus a Roman resident. But since Jason was related to the apostle, who was a Jew of Cilicia, there is an equal probability that he would be known to the Syrian and Cilician churches before his residence at Thessalonica. Again, if Alexander be the same who was excommunicated by St. Paul at Ephesus (1 Tim. i. 20), his name and character would be probably known to the Eastern Christians.

7. Jason and Alexander most likely known at Antioch.

8. The passage xii. 25-xiii. 1 seems to imply that Antioch was the local centre of thought, both to the writer himself and to Theophilus. For the return of Barnabas and Saul is mentioned, without naming the place to which they returned, though a whole chapter has intervened. Again, the phrase in the following verse is very peculiar. "Now there were in Antioch, *κατὰ τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν*, in the church *that was there* (R.V.), prophets and teachers." It is difficult to understand why the simpler expression "in the church of Antioch," or "in the church that was at

8. The phrase, *τὴν οὔσαν ἐκκλησίαν* (Acts xiii. 1).

Antioch," should not have been used, unless it was meant to imply that these teachers belonged to the same church, which Theophilus knew to exist in Antioch when the narrative was composed. The words might be thus paraphrased, "There were at Antioch, as it then was, in the church which is now well known to you, prophets and teachers; and some of the more eminent, with whose names you are already familiar, besides Barnabas and Saul, were Simeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod." This last circumstance would be more likely to have interest for a Syrian than for a Roman convert.

9. The notices
of Mark and
Timothy.

9. There is a remarkable difference between the manner of introducing Mark and Timothy to the notice of the reader. The former is spoken of as a person already known (Acts xii. 12, 25; xiii. 5, 13), but Timothy as a stranger (Acts xvi. 1). Now if Theophilus were converted at Rome during St. Paul's imprisonment, both of them would, in all probability, be equally known to him, since both were present with the apostle at that time. But if he resided in or near Antioch, the difference can be explained. For Mark was twice at Antioch, once before the first circuit of the apostle, and again after the council at Jerusalem, and he seems to have returned to the east in the latter part of St. Paul's imprisonment (Col. iv. 10). But Timothy could not have been at Antioch, from the time of his joining St. Paul to the date of the history, except it were on the visit (Acts xviii. 22). Even at that time we have no proof that he was present, and if he were, the visit seems to have been short and hasty. Hence, if Theophilus dwelt near Antioch, St. Mark, it is likely, would be personally known to him, and Timothy unknown, except by reputation.

10. τὰ
ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη
(Acts xix. 1).

10. The expression (Acts xix. 1), that Paul "went through the upper parts," appears to indicate the residence of Theophilus in or near the peninsula of Asia Minor. For the phrase is elliptical, and denotes evidently the eastern portion of that peninsula farthest from the Ægean. Hence it would be more likely to be used in writing to one familiar with the geography of that peninsula, and with the terms

in popular use, to distinguish the inland parts from the western provinces, than in addressing a native or resident of Italy.

11. The account of the stay at Ephesus lends us help towards some negative conclusions on the abode of Theophilus. Clearly he was not a resident near Ephesus, from the mention of the school of Tyrannus, and of Demetrius, as a place and person unknown. He was neither a Macedonian, nor present with St. Paul in his imprisonment at Rome, since Gaius and Aristarchus were alike unknown to him, and have to be specified as companions of the apostle, and men of Macedonia. He was familiar, however, with the office of the Asiarchs, of the town-clerk, and of the Roman courts and provincial regulations. The account of the voyage, that follows, implies a general acquaintance with the coast line of Asia Minor, which is equally apparent in the later part of the narrative.

11. Theophilus not resident at Ephesus, and yet familiar with the line of coast.

12. The account of the stay at Jerusalem, though it offers no decisive evidence, appears to indicate a Syrian rather than an Italian locality, in the person addressed. The expression, "Paul went in with us unto James," would be familiar at Antioch, where "certain who came from James" (Gal. ii. 12) had caused such dissension in the church, but would need explaining to a recent Italian convert. It seems implied that Trophimus the Ephesian was not personally known to Theophilus, but that he was acquainted with the appearance of the Egyptian false prophet, and the character of the Sicarii, the Jewish nickname for Christians, the marriage of Felix with Drusilla, and the relationship and government of Agrippa and Bernice. All these indications agree better with a residence of Theophilus in Syria than in Italy.

12. Notices of St. Paul at Jerusalem.

13. The narrative of the voyage itself will be found to agree better with the same hypothesis, though an opposite conclusion has been sometimes drawn from it. And first, the expression "that we should sail away into Italy," ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν (Acts xxvii. 1), is suited rather to a position at Antioch than at Rome. If St. Luke and Theophilus were actually at Rome, the

13. And of the voyage to Rome.

simple verb, "to sail into Italy," would be more natural. The mention of Aristarchus shows plainly that he was a stranger to Theophilus. "They sailed under Cyprus, the winds being contrary," which means clearly, on its eastern and northern side. Now it seems more natural to interpret the phrase with reference to some fixed point of comparison, than to the variable direction of the wind, and the under side of the island would be the north-eastern to a resident in Cilicia or Syria. In like manner the eastern part of Crete, by Salmone, is regarded as the under side. Theophilus is plainly supposed to be familiar with the Jewish fast, on the day of Atonement, as indicative of a particular season of the year, but unacquainted with the southern coast of Crete, the situation of the Fair Havens and Phenice, and the very existence of the islet, Clauda. Melita or Malta is described, if not as entirely unknown to him, at least as unfamiliar, or else the expression would be, "they recognized that the island *was* Melita." The term *barbarians*, applied to its inhabitants, implies that Theophilus lived in the midst of a Greek population. The brief mention of Syracuse, Rhegium, Puteoli, Tres Tabernæ, and Appii Forum, implies only such a knowledge of geography, in the main approach to Rome, as an educated provincial would naturally share with the inhabitants of Italy. The only reasonable doubt relates to Puteoli, since Josephus uses the name Dicæarchia, and adds that the Italians call it Puteoli ("Life of Josephus," sec. 3). Both names, however, were probably familiar, and St. Luke, having just resided for two years in Rome, would naturally employ the name which was current there. The expression, "from thence the brethren came to meet us, as far as Appii Forum and the Three Taverns," implies strongly that the writer was not actually at Rome when writing it, or else the word "thence" would probably be omitted. Again, if Theophilus resided at Rome, he would probably be aware already that there were disciples at Puteoli, while the language of the historian clearly implies the reverse. A convert, however, in Syria, while he would know that there was a church at Rome, could not be expected to know that there was one

at Puteoli also. The phrase, again, "when we came to Rome," agrees best with the supposition that neither the writer nor Theophilus were actually there, when the words *παραγενομένων ἡμῶν* would probably be employed, without specifying the place, just as in the case of the Roman Jews. The mention, also, of Paul's residence for two years in a hired house of his own, would be superfluous, if Theophilus were one of his Roman converts, and residing in the city.

All these observations converge to the same result, that the residence of Theophilus was in or near Antioch. This agrees perfectly with the usual tradition of early writers, that St. Luke himself was a native or a resident of that city. In this case the publication of the history may perhaps be fixed within very narrow limits. It could not have been published until two full years after St. Paul had arrived at Rome. St. Luke remained with him there, until the letters had been sent to Ephesus, Colosse, and Philemon, when the prospect of his release was so hopeful, that Philemon was instructed to prepare him a lodging. At the date, however, of the letter to the Philippians, St. Luke seems to have been absent. The two years were probably then complete, and the apostle's release was close at hand. The places to which the evangelist was most likely to return were Cæsarea, Antioch, Troas, and Philippi. But Epaphroditus and Timothy were both sent to Philippi, and hence it is probable that St. Luke had gone to Cæsarea or Antioch, or to both successively. This is the more likely, as he had been absent from Antioch, at the very least, five years. Assuming him to have returned to the church of Antioch, the interest attaching to the voyage of St. Paul, his persecution at Jerusalem, and his detention at Rome, must have awakened a lively emotion in that place, one of the chief scenes of his early labours. The presence, too, of Theophilus, to whom the gospel had been addressed, would be a further motive to St. Luke for composing this second narrative, or for completing and publishing it, if already composed. But the freshness of the style in the closing chapters, and the want of any allusion to St. Paul's release, make it highly probable that it was published before any

All favour the opinion that Theophilus was resident at Antioch, which, as tradition tells us, was the native place of Luke.

St. Luke apparently absent from Rome at the close of St. Paul's imprisonment, probably present at Antioch, engaged in publishing the Acts, A.D. 63.

tidings of his departure from Italy had reached St. Luke at Antioch. We may assign it, then, to the latter half of A.D. 63, and the deviation of a single year, earlier or later, would involve a considerable degree of historical improbability.

The three first gospels were written in gradual succession earlier.

The date thus ascertained will serve to throw much light on the question respecting the time of publication of the three first gospels. It has been shown, by a great amount of internal evidence, that they were composed in their actual order, and that each later evangelist was acquainted with the gospel or gospels previously written. But the gospel of St. Luke was plainly written before the Book of Acts, which refers to it in the opening verse, and is its historical continuation. Three successive dates have therefore to be assigned, before A.D. 63, for the dates of these three gospels, and we shall hope to show that the latest of the three cannot reasonably be placed much later than A.D. 50, or about twenty years from the date of the crucifixion.

And correspond with three marked periods of history.

The history in the Book of Acts plainly separates into three main portions. The first reaches from the Ascension to the close of ch. xi., and to the rise of the church at Antioch. The second is a period of transition, ch. xii.-xv., and ends with the vision at Troas, and the passing over of the gospel into Europe, while the third reaches onward to the close of the history. In each of these periods the church had a different character and position. In the first it was entirely or mainly Jewish, and only began, towards the close of the period, to have an accession of Gentile converts. In the second, the Gentile converts were more numerous, but the Jewish element still prevailed, and the footing on which the Gentiles were to be received had not been the subject of a public and formal decision. In the third, after the council at Jerusalem, the gospel was preached still more widely, larger accessions from the Gentiles were gathered in, and many churches consisted mainly of recent converts from heathen idolatry.

Now the first gospel, on the most general view, has clear signs of a special adaptation to Jewish readers. The second, which is based upon it, retains in part the same

character; but all the modifications are such as to render it more suitable than the first for Gentile converts, as in ch. vii., where there is a formal explanation of Jewish traditions and usages. The third gospel, again, is plainly adapted for Greeks, rather than for Jews, and for those who were not familiar with the minute geography of Judea and Galilee. There is thus a general and marked agreement between the character of these three gospels, and the three successive periods of St. Luke's narrative, within the course of which they must have been written, at intervals, and in succession. And hence there will arise a considerable presumption that the first gospel belongs to the first period, A.D. 30-44, the second to the second period, A.D. 44-50, and the gospel of St. Luke to the third and last period, or A.D. 50-63, so that each would be specially adapted to the state of the church at the time when it was written.

Again, the chief centres from which the gospel spread successively, it appears from the Book of Acts, were Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, and finally Cæsarea and Rome. But several years would probably elapse at each place, and especially at Jerusalem, before the want would be felt of a written gospel for the new converts. Now the first gospel was clearly written in and for Palestine, and probably therefore in the mother church of Jerusalem. The third gospel of St. Luke, it results from the previous inquiry, was written in and for Antioch, the third of these historical centres. And hence a further presumption that the three earliest centres of the Christian Church, Jerusalem, Cæsarea, and Antioch, were really the places where these three gospels were respectively composed. It will be the object of the following chapters to confirm these general presumptions, and add to their precision, by a more complete and inductive inquiry with regard to each gospel.

And three successive centres of church activity.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE DATE AND AUTHENTICITY OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

THE general review of the history in the Book of Acts, compared with the distinctive features of the three first gospels, would lead us to a probable inference, that St. Luke wrote his gospel during the period A.D. 50-63, between the date of the council at Jerusalem, and the close of his own history. We have now to combine the evidence, which enables us to fix its date within narrower limits.

The gospel
was written at
some interval
before the
Book of Acts.

I. First, the gospel seems to have been written at some interval before the Book of Acts. Several writers, indeed, as Professor Tholuck, and Greswell, in his valuable "Dissertations," have held an opposite opinion, that they were written in immediate succession. But a close comparison will justify the assertion, just made, of a separation between them. The gospel is evidently complete in itself; more complete in one respect than the two others, since it contains a brief account of our Lord's Ascension. This deviation from their example would be less probable, if the writer was then purposing to continue the history in a second work. The first twelve verses in the Book of Acts merely repeat and enlarge the account at the close of the gospel, before the narrative advances one step further. This naturally implies that there was some interval of time between the two works, and that the writer had the distinct impression of beginning entirely anew. The space of forty days is also mentioned only in the Acts, while the gospel reports the events of the first and last days only, without any formal transition between them. This is another feature of the same kind, which implies that the composition was discontinuous. Again, it is said in the gospel

that our Lord led his disciples as far as Bethany. But the Book of Acts, instead of continuing with the words—"then returned they from Bethany," gives another statement, complete in itself, and independent, "then returned they to Jerusalem from the Mount, which is called the Mount of Olives, which is nigh to Jerusalem, distant a sabbath-day's journey." The preface of the gospel, also, gives no trace of a purpose, at that time, to continue the history farther than those who had written before him. The writer intends to give Theophilus simply a narrative of our Lord's own ministry, death, and resurrection, which were the essential basis of Christian doctrine. There is also a certain difference of style between the two works, which tends to confirm the same view, that an interval of some years occurred before the later work was written.

II. The next mark of time is more definite. In 1 Tim. v. 17, 18, we find the following passage: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially them that labour in word and doctrine. For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; and, The labourer is worthy of his reward." St. Paul here makes two short quotations to confirm his own injunction, and calls them alike by the name of Scripture. The former is taken from Deut. xxv. 4, and has been quoted by him before in a previous epistle, 1 Cor. ix. 9. The latter occurs *verbatim* Luke x. 7, in the Mission of the Seventy, and is a sentence of our Lord on the very subject of which St. Paul is speaking, the maintenance of Christ's ministers. The plain and simple inference is, that St. Paul here quotes St. Luke's gospel, as Scripture, on the same footing of authority with the law of Moses. Such a quotation implies further, that the gospel was already known to Timothy and accepted by Christians as part of the written code of the New Testament. Such a currency and acceptance may reasonably be held to imply a previous circulation of eight or ten years.

The reference, 1 Tim. v. 18, implies a date not later than A.D. 57.

The date of the first epistle to Timothy may be safely fixed, from the evidence in the *Horæ Paulinæ et Apostolicæ*, to the autumn of A.D. 64, or A.D. 65. And hence we may

infer, with considerable probability, that A.D. 57 is the latest date that can be assigned to the gospel of St. Luke.

III. The passage, 2 Cor. viii. 18-21, has to be next considered. Origen, Jerome, and the pseudo-Ignatius,¹ all refer these words to St. Luke and his gospel, and the same view has been held by Grotius, Hammond, Whitby, and many other critics in modern times. This reference, however, has been rejected by Lardner, Michaelis, and the majority of recent critics, being inconsistent with their opinion of the later origin of the gospel. But since the last argument has made it probable that it was written as early as A.D. 57, the very year of the epistle, if it can be shown that St. Luke is the person meant, it will be a natural inference that St. Paul refers to the written gospel.

1. First, St. Luke is the person to whom St. Paul here alludes. He is distinguished by a specific mark, that he had been selected by the churches of Macedonia their joint trustee with the apostle in conveying their alms to Jerusalem. "We have sent with him our brother, whose praise in the gospel is in all the churches; and not only so, but who has been chosen by the churches to travel along with us with this grace, which is administered by us, to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind; avoiding this, that no man blame us in this abundance which is administered by us; providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men."

It is plain, from these latter clauses, that St. Paul does not refer to a general association of this brother with himself in spreading the gospel, but means a special selection to be his fellow-traveller, in conveying the alms from Macedonia to the church at Jerusalem.

Now the Book of Acts gives a list of all his companions on that voyage—Sopater of Berea, Aristarchus, Secundus of Thessalonica, Gaius of Derbe, Timothy, Tychicus and Trophimus, and St. Luke himself, the historian. Of these Timothy is excluded, because his name is joined with St. Paul's in the superscription of the letter, so that he could not

The phrase,
2 Cor. viii. 18,
"the brother
whose praise
is in the
gospel."

1. Shown to
refer to St.
Luke.

¹ Origen, Hom. ad Luc. I. quoted by Jerome Ps. Ign. ad Eph. xv.

have been one of the messengers to Corinth. Sopater, Aristarchus, and Secundus, and probably Gaius (Acts xix. 29), were all Macedonians, and 2 Cor. ix. 4 shows that these messengers were not "men of Macedonia." Tychicus, Trophimus, and Luke are thus the only persons who could be meant by the apostle. We have no proof in the history that Tychicus accompanied St. Paul as far as Jerusalem, while we know that this was the case with the two others. Both of them, it is probable, accompanied Titus on this visit to Corinth. But two reasons prove that St. Luke, and not Trophimus, is the brother first named, who received a special commission to take charge of the contribution. He alone, of all the companions, set out with St. Paul, the others having gone before to Troas (Acts xx. 6). But a companion, who was absent at the outset, would not satisfy the full purpose of the appointment, which was to provide things honest in the sight of men, and to shield St. Paul from the malicious charge of having purloined a part of the contribution. And again, he is the only person of whom we can be sure that he was with the apostle when the charge was resigned, and the alms reached their destination. "The next day Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present." This very care of the writer to specify his own presence with St. Paul, at the beginning and end of the journey, seems to imply a consciousness of the joint commission he had received, and of his desire to record its fulfilment. Again, St. Luke was a preacher of the gospel when St. Paul crossed over into Europe, two years before a church was founded at Ephesus, while Trophimus was a Gentile of that city, and probably a convert during St. Paul's residence. Hence the proof seems to be morally complete, that the commendation in the letter belongs to St. Luke, and no other person.

2. Secondly, the description of this brother, "whose praise in the gospel is in all the churches," ought naturally to be referred to his known character as an evangelist, and writer of the third gospel which bears his name. Such was the view of Origen and Jerome, and it is mentioned as being current in his own day by Chrysostom, although he

2. And in his character as author of a written gospel.

himself inclines to think the phrase refers to Barnabas (Hom. xviii. in 2 Cor.), and it has been forsaken by many recent critics on very insufficient grounds. Besides their supposition that the gospel was of later date, they urge that such a use of the word, for a written composition, is also of later origin, and does not occur in the New Testament.

This objection, however, is of no real weight. When once the term was in general use among Christians to denote the great facts of Christianity, the application of it to any written narrative of those facts would be spontaneous and inevitable. An usage so natural, so directly resulting from the necessary laws of thought, could not require many years for its introduction. *The Lord's supper* (1 Cor. xi. 20), *the Lord's day* (Rev. i. 10), and *the church*, as a place of worship (1 Cor. xi. 22), are phrases which occur only once in the New Testament, but have all become usual in later times. The circumstance that each of these, as also *the gospel*, for a written work, occurs once only, is no disproof of a meaning that results from the context in each instance. If the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark had been published several years at the date of the letter, there would certainly have been time for such an application of the term to become frequent. In fact, the opening words of St. Mark tend at once to this very usage, where he speaks of "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." And even if no other gospel had been written, the use of the term by St. Paul, in referring to the composition of St. Luke, would be quite natural. For if this were the most appropriate name for such a narrative, by which it was to be constantly known afterwards, who could be more suitable than the apostle himself to set the example of this usage to other Christians? But since two gospels, as it appears from the previous inquiry, had been written before it, both the general laws of thought, and the heading of St. Mark's narrative, make it highly probable that this use of the term had actually begun some years before the apostle wrote his letter to Corinth.

The passage itself, when fairly weighed, proves this to be the true meaning. It has been shown that St. Luke, and

no other, is the party here described. Now the words are a definition, by which he might be identified and distinguished from all the other companions of the apostle. The arrangement of the two clauses deserves notice. "We have sent with him the brother, whose praise in the gospel is in all the churches, and not only so, but who has been chosen," etc. First, we have a character by which he was widely known to others, and to the Corinthians themselves; and next, an additional honour, and proof of general confidence, which he had just received. The office of preaching the gospel was shared by St. Luke with a hundred others, and among these, with every one of the brethren who were then present with the apostle. But there were two persons only, Mark and Luke, not apostles themselves, who were honoured to be the authors of a written gospel, received and owned by all the churches. Of these Mark was not at that time a companion of St. Paul, and had not been for several years; and his gospel, if known at all in Greece, would be far less likely to command speedy notice and general honour than that of St. Luke, which contains such a large amount of original information. Since St. Paul does not name the brother of whom he speaks, the description must have been, to the Corinthians, equivalent to the mention of his name. "We have sent," not a brother, or one out of many, but "*the* brother, whose praise in the gospel is in all the churches." On this very journey Titus had two companions, who were "messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ." Since it has been proved that Luke is the person meant, and highly probable, from the quotation, 2 Tim. v. 19, that his gospel was already written, while the phrase is plainly a definition, the proof seems to be complete that St. Paul alludes to him with honour and affection as the author of that gospel which still bears his name.

IV. This conclusion will be further confirmed from the history of the evangelist. It will thus appear to be probable that his gospel was written about six years before the date of the letter, so that copies of it might have been already known and read in the churches of Macedonia and

Hence, comparing St. Luke's history, it may be inferred that the gospel was written by him

at Antioch
before he
joined the
apostle at
Troas, A.D. 51.

Achaia. The description, given of him by St. Paul, would thus be most significant, and accurately true, at the time when the letter was sent to Corinth.

St. Luke, from his own narrative, joined St. Paul at Troas, before he crossed into Europe, to preach the gospel in Macedonia. He appears to have stayed behind at Philippi, while Paul, Silas, and Timothy went on to Thessalonica and Corinth. No hint of his presence is given, till we again find him with St. Paul at Philippi, five years later, before the voyage to Jerusalem. From 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19, we may infer that he was known at Corinth by reputation, rather than by personal acquaintance. He was chosen by the churches of Macedonia to be joint trustee with the apostle, which is a presumption that he had resided some time among them. Among St. Paul's other companions on that voyage, we have one from Berea, and two from Thessalonica, and we may well suppose that Philippi had some representative in the little company, as it took precedence of the other churches in his love (Acts xvi. 12 ; Phil. iv. 15, 16). Hence it is likely that St. Luke himself was its representative, and had spent most of the interval in that city. Yet he would be not unlikely to have visited Jerusalem and Antioch again, drawn to one by the sacred festivals, and to the other by his own conversion and previous residence. The gospel might thus be well known to the churches of Greece in A.D. 57, whether it were written before the entrance into Europe, or during the earlier part of his residence at Philippi.

Theophilus, however, it has been shown by probable evidence, was a Gentile proselyte of rank, living in or near Antioch. Hence it is likely that the gospel would be written while St. Luke was residing there, rather than at Philippi; and the notes of time, Luke iii. 1, seem exactly suited to a Syrian Greek writing at Antioch. The full details in Acts xvi. are a clear sign that Theophilus did not reside at Philippi, and was not acquainted with the origin of that church, or the geography of the province. And even if St. Luke had paid a short visit to Antioch after the first entrance into Europe, the occasion seems less natural for

the work, than a continued residence with Theophilus in that city. Other reasons equally forbid us to place its composition much earlier. And hence a probable date will be A.D. 51, after the departure of Paul and Silas from Antioch, before the evangelist joined them at Troas on their way to Philippi. In this case it would have been published six years, when St. Paul alluded to it in the letter to Corinth; and thirteen years, when he quoted it, as inspired Scripture, like the law of Moses, in writing to the beloved Timothy.

The circumstances under which St. Luke joined the apostle agree well with this supposition. He did not travel with Paul and Silas, when they set out from Antioch, nor during their circuit through Syria, Cilicia, Phrygia, and Galatia, which probably occupied nearly a whole year. By a special direction of the Spirit, they were hindered from preaching in Bithynia, and guided to Troas on the sea coast. Here we find St. Luke not only in their company, but a sharer in their public commission. "After he had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us to preach the gospel unto them." The silence of the writer seems to imply that Theophilus knew the circumstances under which he joined them, and the nature of his own claim to a share in their public commission. If he had spent the time since their departure in completing his gospel at Antioch, Theophilus would clearly know what had detained him, and the call he had afterwards received to take part in their labours. The same Spirit, who suffered not Paul and Silas to go into Bithynia, but guided them to Troas, might equally have directed St. Luke, by one of the prophets at Antioch, to go down to that seaport and join their little company.

V. The gospel was plainly written with a special reference to Greek converts. When their number had become large, in districts remote from Palestine, and writing had already been used in the instruction of the churches, a gospel suited to their wants would hardly be long delayed. Now the first epistle of Paul was written from Corinth, within one year

The council at Jerusalem would emphasize the need for a gospel especially adapted to the Greeks.

from the vision at Troas. After ten years from the conversion of Cornelius, A.D. 41, and the first preaching to the Gentiles at Antioch, and seven years from the mission of Barnabas and Saul, the number of Gentile converts must have been very considerable throughout Syria, Cilicia, and a great part of Asia Minor. A council had been held regarding them, their exemption from the Mosaic law proclaimed, and copies of its decree were circulated in Asia Minor by Paul and Silas on this very journey. The importance had thus been already felt, of setting truth before these churches in a permanent and written form. The want of a narrative of our Lord's ministry and death, suited to this numerous class of disciples, would therefore be widely perceived. Imperfect accounts would be sure to appear early, amidst so many educated Greek converts as would be found at Antioch; and hence the date proposed, just before the apostle's passage into Europe, agrees with the actual wants of the Church of Christ.

St. Luke's
long stay at
Philippi would
favour its dis-
semination.

VI. The stay of St. Luke at Philippi, on this view of the date, acquires a practical significance. Having joined St. Paul so lately, and with an express call to preach the gospel in Macedonia along with him, why does he stay behind at the very first place, where a church is founded? His vocation, we may perhaps infer, was not so much to help in forming new churches, as to confirm and strengthen those which had been formed already. Philippi had long the foremost place in St. Paul's affection. A signal persecution was there followed by a peculiar miracle of Divine power, not repeated elsewhere, and by a remarkable conversion. It was the chief town of one of the four divisions of Macedonia, and a maritime city. No place could be more suitable for the stay of St. Luke, if his special call were to build up believers in the young churches of Europe by a fuller instruction in the facts and doctrines of the Christian revelation. The written gospel, if brought with him into Macedonia, would be diffused from a known centre, under apostolic sanction, through all the churches of Macedonia and Achaia. Philippi would thus be the place from which the written gospel was diffused; as

Thessalonica, for six years, was the only church favoured with an apostolic letter. Indeed it is hard to believe that after a charge had been given for the public reading of these two letters, there had been as yet provided for the very same churches no authorized record of our Saviour's life, miracles, discourses, death, and resurrection. On the view here proposed, all is consistent and regular. St. Luke would bring his gospel with him into Macedonia; copies would be sent under his direction to the churches of Macedonia and Greece, as they were successively formed; the direct teaching of the Lord himself would take precedence of the letters of his apostle, and St. Luke would fulfil his own share in the commission to the whole peninsula, though his residence were confined to Philippi alone.

VII. The preface to the gospel agrees well with the proposed date. It informs us, that "many had taken in hand to set forth in order a narrative of the things that were most surely believed among the early Christians, as these were set forth by the eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." Now this would be very probably true at Antioch, ten years after the church was founded in that city. It was by far the largest of those towns which received the gospel early, and was the very birth-place of the Christian name. Many imperfect narratives would be likely to spring up in such a place, when the gospel had once begun to spread widely among its Gentile residents, since the deepest interest would be felt in their new faith, and many of the converts, doubtless, would have received a liberal education in that main seat of political power and of Greek refinement and learning. The laws of human nature must have been suspended by a miracle, or such writings would be certain to appear. They would probably be written, like St. Luke's gospel itself, to persons who were recent converts, imperfectly informed on the facts of the gospel, and would thus partake of the nature of private letters. It was important that these more hasty and imperfect reports should be superseded by a distinct and full narrative, suited especially to this class of converts; and this is precisely what St. Luke has done. Neither the gospel of St. Mat-

The preface
to the gospel
accords well
with this date.

thew nor of St. Mark, from their special purpose, could entirely supply the want of these Christians of Antioch. Most of the teachers there had also been intimate with one or other of the apostles, and there had been a continual intercourse with the mother church of Jerusalem, so that the motives for attempting a history of the Lord would exist early, and be in powerful operation.

The preface also mentions two distinct classes of Christian teachers, of whom some were eye-witnesses from the beginning, and others had only a secondary acquaintance with the gospel history. Such would clearly be the case about twenty years after our Lord's ascension. St. Luke refers himself to the second class, and claims authority for his narrative from his diligence in collecting information, and the accurate knowledge he had gained by means of eye-witnesses. This character is peculiar to the third gospel, which has the air of an history, the fruit of research and inquiry, rather than of direct, personal observation. A writer under such circumstances would not be very likely to delay his narrative many years after his inquiries were complete. But from the arrival at Philippi to the close of the narrative, the openings for such inquiries would probably be much more limited, than during the previous residence of several years at Antioch, when the intercourse with the apostles and teachers of the mother church must have been very frequent.

The numerous allusions to Herod's household point to the author's residence at Antioch.

VIII. The writings of St. Luke are marked by the repeated mention of Herod the tetrarch, and of his household. This evangelist alone has mentioned the trial of Jesus before Herod in Jerusalem, the name of Chuza, the tetrarch's steward, of Joanna, his wife, and of Manaen, Herod's foster brother. If the gospel were written at Antioch, while Manaen was still an eminent teacher of that church, many facts respecting Herod, and his intercourse with the Jews and with Jesus, might be learned from him; and Chuza and Joanna, as well as Manaen, might be known by name to Theophilus and many others. But the later we place the composition of the gospel, the less probable would be this introduction of particulars relative

to Herod, which are found nowhere else in the New Testament.

IX. There is an allusion, Luke xiii. 1-6, to certain Galileans, whom Pilate had slain while they were offering their sacrifices. They are introduced definitely, so as to imply that the fact was already familiar to most readers. The event took place, it is probable, two or three months before the crucifixion, and occasioned the feud between Herod and Pilate, which the latter healed at that time, by a compliment paid to Herod's jurisdiction over Galilee. But if the history came thirty years after the event, this definite mode of expression would be less suitable than at the distance of twenty years, proposed above for the date of the gospel. The memory of those earlier troubles under Pilate, would be revived by the slaughter at the Passover, A.D. 49 or 50, in the procuratorship of Cumanus, only one or two years before the time when the gospel was probably written at Antioch. The recollection of a similar catastrophe, which had occurred twenty years earlier, would thus be likely to recur powerfully to the minds of the Syrian readers.

The recollection of the Galileans slain by Pilate would be revived by the slaughter at the Passover under Cumanus, A.D. 49 or 50.

X. The mention of the census, Luke ii. 2, which has been made a chief reason for impeaching St. Luke's accuracy of knowledge, will be found, on inquiry, to confirm the view that his gospel was written at Antioch, and at an early date. Its difficulty, and the amount of discussion it has caused, require a careful examination of its meaning.

St. Luke's description of the census (ii. 2) confirms the present view.

The words in Greek are these, *Αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*, for which six or seven versions have been proposed. 1. This taxing was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria (E. T. and Strauss). 2. The taxing itself was first made when Cyrenius was governor of Syria (Whiston, Hales, Paulus). 3. This taxing first took effect, etc. (Calvin, Valesius). 4. This enrolment was the first that was made, Cyrenius being extraordinary governor (Beza, Grotius, Browne). 5. This is the first enrolment of Cyrenius, while governing Syria (Scaliger). 6. This is the first enrolment of Cyrenius, the governor (*i.e.*, who afterwards became governor) of Syria

(Lardner, Paley). 7. This enrolment took place before Cyrenius was governor of Syria (Theophylact, Herwart, Tholuck, Greswell). Of these the first is either unmeaning, or is virtually the same with the third, and the sixth is opposed to the plain laws of Greek syntax, where the article is absent. The second and third are open to the same historical objection, since they separate the decree by ten years from its execution; while the context seems to imply that it took place at once, and there is no hint, in the other accounts of the later taxing, that it was the execution of an earlier decree. Besides this, the fundamental objection applies, that ἀπογραφή cannot denote the taxing, as contrasted with the enrolment, and that ἐγένετο cannot without real violence be rendered "took effect." The fourth and fifth, with a slight grammatical difference, involve the common supposition, that the census was during an extraordinary commission of Cyrenius, and different from another made in his ordinary presidency. The choice really lies between one of these, and the last construction, which receives the words as a simple notice, to distinguish the event from the later census in the presidency of Cyrenius.

1. First, it is plain that St. Luke, in these words, never meant to identify this census with the later one to which he alludes, Acts v. 37, and which was certainly in the presidency of Cyrenius. This is clear from the words alone, since the word πρώτη would be unmeaning on this view, and the clause could only receive such a sense by omitting it entirely.

But historically, this is just as plain. The census of Cyrenius and the death of Augustus were only eight years asunder. That census was clearly familiar to the writer, from his allusion to it in Acts v. 37, without a word of explanation. The death of Augustus must have been equally familiar to a writer who names the tetrarchs of Galilee, Trachonitis, and Abila, and numbers the years of Tiberius. But in the next chapter the ministry of John is referred to the fifteenth of Tiberius, and the age of Jesus, when baptized soon afterwards, is said to be thirty years. No writer of common sense could place the birth of our Lord at a time familiarly known to be about eight years before the death of

Augustus, and then say, in a few verses after, that he was about thirty years old in the fifteenth of Tiberius. This would not be an historical error, so much as a gross arithmetical blunder. In both grounds, then, of grammar and historical common sense, it is impossible that the evangelist can here have identified his census with the later and more noted enrolment in the time of Cyrenius.

2. There is no historical evidence, apart from this passage, that Cyrenius was employed in an earlier census. An inscription with reference to the enrolment of Apamea has been quoted by some writers, in proof that he was so employed. But the later census, in A.D. 6, was not confined to Judea, as Sanclemente and Browne have asserted. It is plain from Josephus that it included the whole of Syria; so that the inscription must naturally be referred to this same conspicuous enrolment. It is also doubtful whether St. Luke would have used the term "*ἡγεμονεύοντος*" for an extraordinary commission. But still further, if Cyrenius had then been present, there seems no reason why the writer should have specified the fact; since it would only tend, without fuller explanation, to defeat his purpose, and to confound the census with another, far more commonly associated with his name, as the president of Syria.

3. The form here used, *ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*, is the same which St. Luke employs elsewhere in the definition of time, and is constantly so employed by classic writers, both with and without a preposition. We have instances in Luke iii. 1, 2, Acts xviii. 12, where the construction is precisely similar. It is therefore most natural to infer that the words are here also used in the same way, and that some averment is made with reference to the time when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, just as elsewhere in regard to the time when Pilate was governor of Judea, or when Gallio was deputy of Achaia.

4. Since the census must have been distinct from that in the presidency of Cyrenius, and still the genitives must refer to that very presidency, the object of the writer must have been to note, in passing, its earlier occurrence, lest a careless reader should perplex himself by confounding them.

This purpose is exactly fulfilled, if *πρώτη* be a term of comparison, and we translate, with Theophylact, Herwart, Tholuck, and Greswell—"This enrolment took place, before Cyrenius' government of Syria."

5. The use of *πρώτος*, as an emphatic term of comparison, instead of *πρότερον*, has many precedents in Scripture and classic writers. Thus John i. 15, 30, *πρώτός μου ἦν*, and xv. 18, *ἐμὲ πρῶτον ὑμῶν μεμίσηκεν*, and Col. i. 15, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, are clear examples of this usage. In the Septuagint, 2 Sam. xix. 43, *καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη ὁ λόγος μου πρῶτός μοι τοῦ Ἰούδα ἐπιστρέψαι τὸν βασιλέα ἐμοί*, is an instance, and 1 Macc. vii. 41, *ἐσχάτη τῶν ὑμῶν ἡ μήτηρ ἐτελεύτησε*. Many other examples might be given from classic authors.

6. The construction of a genitive of time with prepositions is also very common in the best writers. The extension of the same idiom to adverbs of comparison is perhaps found in the Septuagint only. There, at least, in Jer. xxix. 2, we have a clear instance in the phrase "*ὕστερον ἐξέλθοντος Ἰεχονίου τοῦ βασιλεως*," "after the going forth of Jeconiah the king." This rendering has indeed been disputed (*Ordo Sæcl.*, p. 43), but without any reason, since a comparison of the Septuagint with the Hebrew shows plainly that the above is the true construction. In like manner, *ὕστερον ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου* would certainly mean, "after the presidency of Cyrenius," and *πρότερον κ. τ. λ.*, "before the same presidency."

The key to its interpretation is that the taxing under Cyrenius, A.D. 6, was a familiar era at Antioch.

7. The difficulty of the passage, in this view, arises simply from the combination of two idioms, one of which is frequent in the best classic authorities, and the other finds an exact parallel in the Septuagint, but which are not elsewhere joined together. If the words had been *πρώτη ἐγένετο τῆς Κυρηνίου ἀπογραφῆς*, no doubt of their meaning could have well arisen. Or again, if the phrase *ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου* had occurred in St. Luke, either standing alone, or with a preposition, no one would have doubted that they were a definition of time. How then can the union of the two idioms, which has occasioned so much perplexity, be explained?

The difficulty here arises from the circumstance that, in

every other instance where *πρῶτος* is so employed, the genitive which follows strictly corresponds with the main subject which goes before. If, however, St. Luke wrote at a place and time when the phrase *ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου* was equivalent, in the minds of his readers, to a direct mention of the later taxing, this unusual phraseology will have a sufficient explanation. The census of Cyrenius would probably give rise, from its very nature, to a thousand public and private documents, where this date would be used in this precise form. In subjects which are perfectly familiar, the best writers often consult brevity, rather than grammatical completeness, in their phraseology. St. Luke might have written, *αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο [τῆς ἀπογραφῆς, ἣτις ἐγένετο] ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου*. But the parenthetic words, at the time, would be instinctively supplied, because every Syrian reader of those days would at once associate the presidency of Cyrenius with the important census which he was so well known to have made; since it had been the beginning of a new era to the whole province, and the occasion of a dangerous revolt in Palestine. And conversely, the adoption of this brief and elliptical idiom is a reason for the view, already supported by other arguments, that the gospel was written at Antioch, and addressed to a Syrian convert at an early date, or about the middle of the first century. It is highly probable that, at that period, *ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου* was a law term of constant occurrence in deeds and legal documents throughout Syria, or in Greek inscriptions and records, to which that noted census had given rise. If the work were written about forty-five years after that census occurred, a passing notice that this earlier taxing was distinct from it would be natural, and almost necessary; while the unstudied form of it implies the fullest consciousness in the writer of his familiar acquaintance with Syrian history. He assumes that his readers knew of the later census, which was of great notoriety, and gives them a passing and brief caution that they must not confound it with the earlier and less conspicuous enrolment to which his narrative alludes, at the time of the Nativity.

[By some the researches of Zumpt are thought to throw fresh light upon the question. My father, nearly forty years after the first publication of the "Horæ," renewed his investigation with great thoroughness, and he has left a MS. of more than forty pages in which he supports the view that he has here advanced, and shows that the assumed earlier governorship of Cyrenius is not proven, nor, on a comparison of all the evidence, is it even probable, whilst the date that has been assigned to it does not remove the difficulties of the text.—Ed.]

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL.

THE second gospel, by the unbroken testimony of early writers, is ascribed to St. Mark, an intimate companion of St. Peter, and the same person, it is universally allowed, whom he mentions at the close of his first epistle. Opinions have been more divided on the question, whether this Mark the evangelist be the same with John Mark, the sister's-son¹ to Barnabas, who is mentioned five times in the Book of Acts, and three times in St. Paul's epistles. The more general opinion is, that they are the same; but some few early writers, and a considerable number of modern critics, as Cave, Grotius, Du Pin and Tillemont, and more recently Mr. Greswell, in his "Dissertations," and Da Costa, in his work "The Four Witnesses," hold them to be different. The last of these has a peculiar hypothesis of his own, that the evangelist is probably the devout soldier whom Cornelius sent to Peter before his conversion. ("Four Witnesses," p. 110 and foll.)

Tradition universally assigns the gospel to Mark, the companion of Peter, and most identify the author with the John Mark of the Acts.

Various dates have been assigned to the gospel. According to Irenæus, it was written after the death of St. Peter;² but according to Jerome, Clemens, Papias, and the "Synopsis" of Athanasius, during his life-time; while Theophylact places it ten years after the Ascension.³ Most early writers

Various dates assigned to the gospel.

¹ So the E. V. The true rendering adopted by the Revisers is "cousin." This must be borne in mind throughout the chapter. It hardly in any way affects the argument.—Ed.

² Iren., iii. 1, p. 174; Euseb., "Hist. Ecc.," v. 8.

³ "Jerome ad Hedibiam," Ep. cxx. quæst. xi. vol. i. p. 844; Clem., "Hypotyp.," vi., apud Eus., "H. E.," ii. 15; Papias, apud Euseb., "H. E.," iii. 39. Athan. tom. iv. p. 433 (Migne's Patrol.) Theophylact. Præf. in Ev. Marci.

assert it to have been published at Rome, but Chrysostom in Egypt.¹ The external evidence, it thus appears, is rather imperfect. It becomes the more important to examine carefully the light thrown on its origin by the internal evidence of the New Testament.

The allusions
in the Acts and
the epistles
favour the
claim of John
Mark as
evangelist.

1. First, the allusions and brief notices in the Acts and epistles, yield a strong presumption that John Mark and the evangelist are the same person. For John Mark is named six times in the Book of Acts (Acts xii. 12, 25; xiii. 5, 13; xv. 37-39), and the last time by his Roman surname alone. In the epistles he is named three times, being identified by the description in the first passage, "Marcus, sister's-son to Barnabas" (Col. iv. 10), which proves him to be the same who is mentioned by St. Luke. In these three passages, however, no trace is left of his original name, John, and he is described simply by his surname, MARK. In Philemon 24, and 2 Tim. iv. 11, this name is used without any addition, as enough to identify him. Now in the epistle of St. Peter the name occurs just in the same manner. "The church at Babylon greeteth you, and Mark my son" (1 Pet. v. 13). That John Mark was a convert of St. Peter must be highly probable from the passage Acts xii. 12, where we find that his mother had a house at Jerusalem, in which many Christians met for prayer, and that St. Peter addressed himself first to this company when released from prison. On the other hand, it is not likely that another Mark would be mentioned in this brief manner, when John Mark was familiarly known by his second name only, and was so prominent among the early teachers of the gospel. Nor is it at all likely, to those who believe in the internal harmony of Scripture, that our only notice of the writer of one of the gospels should be this brief expression at the close of one epistle alone, with no mention of his name, or character, or labours, in any other part of the sacred canon.

The fact that the evangelist is called the son of Peter, and is his traditional companion, while John Mark travelled

¹ Chrys., Hom. i. in Matt.

for a time with Barnabas and Paul, then with Barnabas only, and still later with St. Paul again, is no proof that they are different persons. For Silvanus is named in the same verse by St. Peter as his messenger, and yet he was the companion of St. Paul in his first visit to Europe, and his name appears in the superscription of the two letters to the Thessalonians. Hence a similar alternation must be just as credible in the case of the evangelist. In fact, it would only increase the fitness of John Mark to be the writer of a gospel, that he was the honoured companion, not only of one, but of the two most eminent apostles. It may be further observed, that the moral beauty of the record is greatly obscured, if the Mark of St. Peter's epistle, and of St. Luke's narrative, are held to be different persons. For in the narrative, when St. Paul refused to take Mark for his companion, he chose Silas or Silvanus. And here, in St. Peter's salutation, we find that Silvanus is his chosen and beloved messenger, and that Mark is associated in the brotherly greeting which Silvanus has to convey. "By Silvanus that faithful brother, I have written to you. . . The church in Babylon greeteth you, and Mark my son." We can hardly fail to see here an analogy to the notice, 2 Tim. iv. 11, "Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me for the ministry." Timothy and Luke, as well as Silas, had seemed to replace Mark in the apostle's friendship and society; and they are joined with him here, as Silvanus in the other passage, in a manner which implies the most entire harmony, and the high place which they all held alike in the favour of the two chief apostles.

These presumptions are met, apparently, by no counter evidence. For the reasons, which have been drawn from the gospel, to prove the author a Gentile soldier, will be found to admit of another explanation, while there are several features in the work which agree better with the usual hypothesis, that the writer was one of the circumcision.

II. The first mention of John Mark occurs in Acts xii. His mother was a sister of Barnabas, who was himself a

A brief *résumé*
of his history
as given in the
Bible.

Levite of Cyprus. Many, including probably her own son, were gathered for prayer in her house, when Peter startled them by his sudden appearance. Soon after, on the return of Barnabas and Saul, he accompanied them to Antioch. When they began their first circuit, in the same or the following year, Mark was still with them. He accompanied them throughout Cyprus, but left them at Perga, and returned to Jerusalem, and thereby incurred St. Paul's serious displeasure. No mention of him is then given till after the council, when it appears, from Gal. ii. 1, that St. Peter came down to Antioch. Mark was now present there again (Acts xv. 37-39), and Barnabas, against the judgment of Paul, selected him for his companion. The dispute, thus occasioned, led to their separation, and Barnabas and Mark sailed to Cyprus, while Paul chose successively Silas and Timothy, and visited the churches of Asia Minor. From this point the Book of Acts gives us no further light on his history. We learn, however, from Col. iv. 10, that, within the ten years that followed, he had been restored to St. Paul's favour, that a charge to receive him had been given to the Phrygian Christians, and that he was present with the apostle in the second year of his imprisonment at Rome, and had been a special comfort and help to him by his labours in the gospel. At the date of St. Peter's first epistle, he was with that apostle in Babylon, which seems, for several reasons, to be the old Babylon of Mesopotamia, and neither Rome, nor Babylon in Egypt. Still later, when St. Paul was a second time imprisoned at Rome, Mark was in Asia Minor, not far from Ephesus, and was sent for by that apostle, along with Timothy, to receive his dying instructions and commands. Early tradition reports that he became the first bishop of the church at Alexandria, and assigns that city for the final scene of his labours and his death.

The date and object of St. Peter's first epistle. Its object to confirm the teaching of St.

III. To fill up this outline, we must ascertain, if possible, the date of St. Peter's first epistle. No good reason can be given for the view, which has prevailed widely, that the epistle was written from Rome. To introduce a metaphor on such an occasion, without the least hint in the context

to explain it, would be most unnatural in a letter of simple exhortation. And besides, the order in which the provinces are named indicates that the writer was in the east, and not in the west. Accordingly, it is now the usual opinion that the letter was written from Mesopotamia, either amidst the remains of old Babylon, or from Seleucia, which often borrowed the name, as it succeeded to the local importance, of the ancient city.

Paul, its
bearer Silas,
its date about
A.D. 58.

The extreme dates proposed for the letter are A.D. 48 and 65. The former may be rejected for the plain reason that Bithynia and Asia, two of the provinces here named, were not evangelized till some years later, when St. Paul returned from his first visit to Europe. When St. Peter wrote, churches were formed in these districts, and elders presided over them. The letter must then be later than A.D. 52, when St. Paul crossed into Macedonia.

The close of the letter will perhaps enable us to approach still nearer to its date. The true rendering seems to be, "By Silvanus (as I expect), that faithful brother, I have written to you briefly, exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand" (1 Peter v. 12). The slight uncertainty did not refer to the faithfulness of Silvanus, which the article serves to affirm strongly, but merely to the circumstance whether he or some other would prove to be the bearer of the letter. It was addressed to five provinces; and even if Silvanus set out with it on a circuit, it would be uncertain whether it might not reach many of them by other hands. The words *τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ* imply that St. Peter reckoned Silvanus eminently worthy of his confidence in the service of Christ.

Now Silvanus or Silas accompanied St. Paul on his first circuit in Europe, till he reached Corinth, where he continued with him for some time (2 Thess. i.). But after St. Paul's next visit to Jerusalem, no trace of his presence is found, either in the history or the letters. It is probable, then, that from this time Silas joined himself to St. Peter, or at least remained in Palestine, and journeyed to the east. Galatia is one of the five provinces to which St. Peter's letter is addressed. The churches of that district were

founded by St. Paul during his second circuit, when Silas was with him. False teachers had afterwards crept in, who appealed from St. Paul to St. Peter and St. James, as higher authorities, and consequently St. Paul had been compelled, while at Corinth, to write an urgent and sharp reproof. He would be most likely, on his next interview with St. Peter, or by the next messenger who was sent to him, to represent to him the abuse of his name in these churches, so as to encourage a dangerous perversion of the gospel. And in this case, what could be more natural than a letter from St. Peter to these and the adjoining churches, in confirmation of that pure gospel of grace which St. Paul had proclaimed?

The words, 1 Pet. v. 12, acquire a peculiar emphasis on this view. St. Peter writes by Silvanus, who had been present at the council to which St. Paul alludes in his letter, and had been sent to confirm the Gentile converts at Antioch in the freedom of the gospel; and who had since been joined with St. Paul, during his visit to Galatia, in proclaiming the grace of Christ. By the selection of this messenger, St. Peter would distinctly approve and testify the message which Paul and Silas had proclaimed, and which his own name had been perverted into an excuse for opposing. He gives to Silas an emphatic title of honour, "that faithful brother," and adds a brief statement of the special design of the letter, "to testify that this was the true grace of God, wherein they stood," now that they had been humbled by St. Paul's rebuke, and recovered and confirmed by his second visit. The very term employed, *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν*, denotes a further testimony, to confirm one already given, and applies with special force on this view of the history.

The epistle, then, could not be written earlier than the close of A.D. 54, when St. Paul made his second visit to Galatia, nor in A.D. 61, 62, when St. Mark was with St. Paul at Rome, but most probably in the interval between these limits. Perhaps the time of St. Paul's detention at Cæsarea, half way between them, and when he was debarred from personal intercourse with these churches, would be a

likely season for such a message to them from his brother apostle. Hence A.D. 58 is probably an approximation to the real date.

We may now fill up the outline of Mark's travels, conjecturally, as follows. When he accompanied his uncle to Cyprus, they would be likely to extend their course southward or westward, to Crete or Egypt. Crete had certainly been evangelized before St. Paul's release from Rome, and St. Mark is connected by a very constant tradition with the church of Alexandria. He may then have returned to Jerusalem, and connected himself with St. Peter, his own father in the faith, and continued with him till the first epistle was written, four or five years. The instruction, alluded to in Col. iv. 10, must have been given by St. Paul to the Phrygian churches some time before, and most likely on his second visit to that neighbourhood (Acts xviii.). It is thus probable that at that time, Paul, Peter, Barnabas, Mark, and Silas, had a common interview, and that the two latter, leaving Paul and Barnabas, became associated with Peter in his labours to the north and east of Judea.

IV. Let us now resume the direct inquiry into the origin and date of the second gospel. It is the constant tradition of early writers, that it was written by St. Mark, either under the inspection of St. Peter, or from the memory of the apostle's oral statements. The internal evidence agrees fully with the view. Mr. Jones, Dr. Townson, and others, have brought together a large variety of presumptions, which tend to establish it. The history, except a few verses, is limited to the time when Peter had become a companion of our Lord. The house at Capernaum is called, here only, the house of Simon and Andrew. The precedence of Peter among the apostles is more indirectly given; his honour, in the distinctive surname, is qualified by the joint title given, as St. Mark alone informs us, to the sons of Zebedee. The benediction, which followed his confession of Christ, is not given, but the stern reproof that ensued is retained at full length. His fall is stated fully, but nothing is said of his deep repentance, or of the bitterness of his tears. No mention is found of his being the

The probable, though unrecorded, movements of St. Mark.

Connection of St. Peter and St. Mark apparent in the gospel.

first apostle to whom the Lord appeared after the resurrection, while the privilege of the Magdalene is expressly noticed. These features, and many others of the same kind, confirm the tradition, that St. Peter was the chief source of the whole narrative.

Traditional
publication of
St. Mark's
gospel at
Rome.

V. This gospel, by most early writers, is said to have been written and published at Rome. Chrysostom, however, says that it was written in Egypt, and thus proves that the tradition of its Roman origin was not universal, while there are internal marks which seem to prove it erroneous.¹ Yet since Clement, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Gregory, Cosmas, and Eutychius, agree in this opinion, and it is commonly received by modern writers, it becomes necessary to account for its origin, even if weighty evidence be given for denying its truth.²

1. Supported
by the alleged
Latinisms.

The main reason urged in its favour are the Latinisms of this gospel. The following are specified³:—1. λεγεών for Legion (v. 9, 15). 2. σπεκουλάτωρ (vi. 27), executioner. 3. κῆνσος (xii. 14), for *tribute*. 4. κοδράντης (xii. 42), *quadrans*, or *farthing*. 5. φραγελλοῦν (xv. 15), to scourge. 6. αὐλή, ὃ ἐστι πραιτώριον (xv. 16), the hall, that is, the Prætorium. 7. κεντυρίων (xv. 39, etc.), instead of ἐκατόνταρχος, *centurion*. 8. μεσούνκτιον (xiii. 35), for a division of the night. 9. κράββατος (ii. 9, etc.), *couch*. 10. οὐά (xv. 29), *vah*, a term of contempt. 11. παιδιόθεν (ix. 21), *a puero*. 12. σύσσημον (xiv. 44), a token. 13. δηνάριον (xii. 15), a *penny*, where Matthew has, *tribute*. 14. ἀπέχει (xiv. 41), *it is sufficient*. 15. ἀλεκτοροφωνία (xiii. 35), *gallicinium*. 16. ἄμφοδος (xi. 4), *ambivium*. 17. μεθόρια (vii. 24), *confinia*.

Several of these words occur also in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and hence can be no proof that the gospel of St. Mark was specially designed for Latin readers, and still less that it was written at Rome. Thus λεγεών occurs in all three gospels; κοδράντης and φραγελλοῦν, once in St. Matthew, and once only in St. Mark; μεσούνκτιον, once in St. Mark, once in St. Luke's gospel, and twice in the Book

¹ Chrys. Hom. i. in Matt.

² Epiphan., "Hær.," l. 1. See also note 3, p. 2.

³ See Greswell's "Harmony," vol. i. p. 122.

of Acts; κράββατος, five times both in St. Mark and St. John; δηνάριον, six times in Matthew, three times in Mark and Luke. Μεθόρια is also a purely Greek word. And hence the distinctive Latinisms are perhaps three only, κεντυρίων, σπεκουλάτωρ, and οὐά, as a term of contempt, answering to *vah*, the Latin interjection.¹

Even the passage, Mark xv. 16, "the hall, that is, the Prætorium," is no proof that the gospel was designed for Roman, or even for Latin-speaking readers; since Prætorium is used by the three other evangelists, in the Book of Acts, and by St. Paul in his letter to Philippi. Every Prætorium was a hall, but every hall was not a Prætorium. Technical terms of this kind, used by the governing power, are quickly adopted into the language of their subjects. And hence there is no sufficient ground, in these few words, for the conclusion that the gospel was written in Rome or Italy.

Another presumption for the same view has been drawn from xv. 21, where Simon is said to be the father of Alexander and Rufus. For St. Paul salutes Rufus and his mother among the Roman Christians. It is inferred that the evangelist, writing at Rome, has mentioned him and his brother, because they were known residents of that city.

2. The mention of Alexander and Rufus, Mark xv. 21. Cf. Rom. xvi. 13.

This inference, however, is very far from certain. For St. Paul had never been at Rome when he wrote that letter, and still it is clear that Rufus and his mother were personally known to him. Six years before, Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, so that Rufus must have resided elsewhere at that time. His father, Simon, was a Jew of Cyrene, not of Rome, and was attending the Passover at the time of the crucifixion. It is almost certain that his sons, even after one or both of them were become converts, would still frequent that city. The only valid inference seems to be, that Simon was dead when St. Mark wrote, but that his sons were still alive, and that

¹ To these, perhaps, we should add ξίστης (vii. 4), said to be derived from the Latin *sextarius*. On the other hand, οὐά may simply be *onomatopoetic*.—ED.

they were personally known to the evangelist, and to many of the converts whom he first addressed.

On the other hand, the gospel is addressed to residents in Palestine.

On the other hand, there are many signs in St. Mark's gospel, overlooked by those who were pre-occupied by the tradition of its Roman origin, which prove that it was addressed to residents in Palestine. The geographical notices all agree with this view, and disagree with the other. St. Luke, for instance, describes Capernaum as a city of Galilee, while St. Mark refers to it without description, as a place already known. Yet surely the residents of Antioch were more likely to know its position than the inhabitants of Italy. Again, he speaks of the *κωμοπόλεις* or village-towns of Galilee, a special term that implies an acquaintance with the country. The lake of Tiberias is called simply "the sea," an usage hardly intelligible to Italians, and one which clearly implies a reference to the dwellers in Palestine. The phrase, "the other side," is used elliptically, just as in St. Matthew, while St. Luke, who wrote for more distant readers, is careful to explain it by an addition, "the other side of the lake." Gadara is referred to, as already known, in striking contrast to the third gospel. Decapolis is mentioned without the slightest explanation. Nazareth is called our Lord's "own country," though no particulars of his former residence there have been given. Bethsaida is introduced abruptly, in the miracle of the five thousand, and also the land of Genesaret, without any further hint to explain their position. Cæsarea Philippi might perhaps be known to Italian residents, but how could they be expected to understand "the parts of Dalmanutha"? The mention of Jericho, Bethphage, Bethany, the Mount of Olives, of the house of Simon the leper, of Arimathea, and of *the country* as a general term for the vicinity of Jerusalem, are all indications of the same kind. They prove that a knowledge of comparatively obscure localities in Palestine is presupposed. No one instance is found of a geographical explanation, such as would naturally be required by the residents and natives of Italy.

And assumes, in its readers,

The gospel further assumes, in its readers, a general

acquaintance with the customs of the Jews. Thus, in i. 32, there is an implied reference to Jewish scruples about the Sabbath. The Scribes and Pharisees are spoken of as classes familiarly known. The Jewish name, Beelzebub, is introduced without explanation. The feast of the Passover and of unleavened bread are distinguished, while St. Luke comprehends them both under the second name. The Preparation is defined as the day before the Sabbath. In all these cases, a moderate acquaintance with Jewish usages is implied. Yet it is equally plain that this knowledge, on the part of the readers, is supposed to be partial and limited. It is explained, for instance, that the disciples of John and the Pharisees used repeated fasts, which St. Matthew assumes to be well known. In chapter vii. there is formal digression, to explain the practice of the Pharisees. The woman of Canaan, as St. Matthew calls her, receives a name more intelligible to Gentiles, "a Greek, a Syrophenician by race." In the prophecy on the Mount, the clause in the instructions for flight, "neither on the Sabbath," is omitted. The first day of unleavened bread is expounded by the description, "when they used to kill the Passover." Other examples of the same accommodation to Gentile readers may perhaps be found. The readers are supposed to know well the localities of Palestine, but not the minuter elements of Jewish customs and phraseology.

a general acquaintance with the customs, etc., of the Jews.

VI. From the previous inquiry we are led to the following results. The gospel of St. Mark was earlier than that of St. Luke, which was itself probably composed at Antioch, just before that evangelist accompanied St. Paul into Europe. It was adapted, not for residents in Italy, but for Gentiles who lived in Palestine, and who were better acquainted with its outward features and localities than with the rites and customs of the Jews. The writer was also intimately connected with St. Peter, from whose information and ocular testimony he has derived the most distinctive features of his narrative.

It results that the gospel was written for Gentiles in Palestine by one acquainted with St. Peter.

The history of the early church, in the Book of Acts, agrees remarkably with these indications. It naturally

The history in the Acts accords well

with this sup-
position.

divides itself into three periods. The first reaches to the origin of the church at Antioch, and during its course the gospel was mainly confined to Palestine, among those who were Jews by birth. The second period, which reaches to the council, and the first journey into Europe, was one of transition. The Jews were still the majority of the church, but the gospel had begun to spread to the Gentiles, and included many Roman residents in Palestine, with a growing number of Greeks at Antioch and in Asia Minor. In the third and last stage, the admission of the Gentiles was solemnly ratified by the council, and the gospel spread among them on every side with great rapidity. The gospel of St. Luke, it has been shown, was written early in this third period, for the Greeks of Antioch. The gospel of St. Mark has all the features of the second, or transition period, and of a special adaptation to the Roman converts in and near Palestine.

The first Gentile converts were Cornelius the Roman centurion, with his friends and household servants, at Cæsarea. Here was the first nucleus of all the latter accessions from the Gentiles. Cæsarea, in point of time, took precedence of Antioch itself, and was not less favourably situated as a missionary outpost for the spread of the faith. It was the main seaport of Palestine, the seat of the Roman government, and the resort of ten thousand Jews from all quarters, on their way to the great festivals at Jerusalem. A body of Roman soldiers were always present in this important military station, and would be replaced from time to time by new arrivals from Italy, while the former residents would often return home to the West. Cornelius himself was a centurion of "the Italian band." After him the next Gentile convert, whose name is on record, is Sergius Paulus, the Roman deputy of Cyprus, whose conversion could not be without fruit among his countrymen in that island. Men of Cyprus, a little earlier, took the foremost part in spreading the gospel among the Gentiles; and flourishing churches, with members from among the heathen, would be early formed in that province. The evangelist himself had a Jewish name, but a Roman surname, which makes

it probable that he might be a Roman citizen. We are told that there were present, even on the day of Pentecost, *ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι*, or Roman Jews, who from time to time visited or abode in Jerusalem, and some of whom were probably among the converts of that eventful day. The sister of Barnabas, and mother of Mark, whose house was in Jerusalem, might have been married to one of these Roman Jews, and her son have consequently received a Roman surname. In this case he would form a link of natural connection between the Jewish believers, and the first class of Gentile and Roman converts.

During the period, A.D. 46-50, from the time when St. Mark returned to Jerusalem, till the visit of Peter to Antioch, he would probably be in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and in frequent intercourse with that apostle. When eight or nine years had elapsed from the conversion of Cornelius, and four or five from that of Sergius Paulus, a large class of converts would most probably have been formed among the military and civil residents in Cæsarea and Cyprus. All the notices of the Roman soldiery in the New Testament imply a peculiar openness to impressions from the faith of Christ. One centurion in the gospels received a striking testimony of his faith, and another exclaimed at the Crucifixion, "Truly this was the Son of God." Philip the evangelist resided at Cæsarea, and would doubtless be occupied in spreading the faith zealously among the Roman as well as the Jewish residents. Many converts of this class, from time to time, would be leaving Palestine, and returning to Italy. The value of a record of our Saviour's life, adapted to their knowledge and habits of thought, would thus be felt very early. A gospel designed for their use would be brief, that it might be the more portable, and a record of actions, rather than words, as more adapted to the Roman character. It would assume a moderate knowledge of Palestine and of the customs of the Jews, such as Gentile residents in Palestine would naturally acquire, but not the more intimate and full knowledge possessed by Jews themselves. It would probably assume a personal knowledge, on the part of its readers, of

The gospel probably written from A.D. 46-50, and is adapted for military readers.

several leading characters in the Jewish church at the time of its composition. It would be sparing in appeals to the prophets, since these would not be familiar to the Gentile converts. Its chief character would be a vivid exhibition, with historical accuracy and fulness, of those works of power by which Jesus proved his Divine authority, and of his sufferings and resurrection, on which the whole message of the gospel was founded. All these features are conspicuous in St. Mark's gospel, and confirm the conclusion that it was written during this interval, in the transition stage of the church's history.

Hence the tradition of its Roman origin is readily explained.

VII. On the view here maintained, the usual tradition that this gospel was published at Rome will admit of an easy explanation. If it were really written at Cæsarea, or for the Roman converts in that place, about A.D. 48, it would probably be soon carried to Rome by some of the converts of rank and education, like Cornelius and Sergius Paulus, within two or three years from its first appearance. The Roman soldiery of Cæsarea must have been constantly returning to Italy, either in charge of prisoners, as the centurion Julius, or from other calls of public duty. Hence this gospel would be not unlikely to circulate at Rome for several years before either the first or third gospel had reached Italy. And since it would doubtless be known, by those who copied it, under whose direction, or from whose information it was composed, the natural result would be the growth of a tradition that it was written by St. Mark during a visit of St. Peter in the city of Rome, especially since there are a few Latinisms not found in the other gospels.

The last verse ("And they went forth and preached everywhere," etc.) implies that the gospel had been spread widely by the preaching of the apostles, when the work was published. In the year A.D. 48, there were churches in Judea, Galilee, Samaria, Damascus, Syria, Cilicia, Cyprus, Pisidia, Pamphylia, Lycaonia, probably in Abyssinia, Egypt, Cyrene, Mesopotamia, and doubtless in other places, of which no distinct mention is made in the brief and condensed narrative of St. Luke. There is nothing, then, in

these words, which compels us to assign a later origin to the second gospel.

Again, the passage Mark xi. 13 ("The time of figs was not yet") has been thought to imply that it was written in Italy, where the seasons of Palestine would be very imperfectly known, or else it would be clear that the time of figs was later than the Passover. But this construction of the words appears to be groundless. In the first place, the Passover is not mentioned till three chapters later, so that a passing monition of this kind would not be out of place, even for those who knew the seasons. And next, the words seem to refer to that particular tree only, and not to be a general statement, or else the search on the part of our Lord becomes unnatural. There were three times of figs in the year, and some trees, from their aspect, etc., would certainly be earlier or later than others. This fig-tree, as may be inferred from the curse, was not inherently barren. One time of figs was past, another was not come, and meanwhile its appearance was deceptive, having leaves without any fruit. All this made it a fit emblem of the past, the future, and the actual state of the Jewish people.

VIII. It remains now to adduce some further reasons for the opinion, first, that the writer was John Mark, and not some unknown companion of Peter, or a Gentile soldier; and next, that the gospel was written before the council, about A.D. 48, with especial reference to Roman converts at Cæsarea, and in the neighbourhood of Palestine.

Concluding arguments.

When the Book of Acts was written, St. Luke had been the companion of St. Paul during his first imprisonment. Mark, the nephew of Barnabas, had been present at the same time, and is honourably mentioned by the apostle in two epistles, along with Luke himself. In the history, Luke appears to have speedily succeeded Mark, as a companion of the apostle. In the last epistle, just before St. Paul's death, Luke is already with him, and Mark is sent for with a special commendation of his worth. This four-fold association of Mark with Luke is natural and most significant, if these were the only two companions of the apostles who were honoured to be authors of a written gospel.

The connection of St. Mark and St. Luke in Scripture is significant.

The transition character of the gospel suits with the history of Mark the writer.

IX. The first gospel of St. Matthew has clear marks that it was specially intended for Jewish converts ; the third, of St. Luke, has indications, equally clear, that it was addressed mainly to Gentiles. The second gospel of St. Mark, as its order implies, has a middle character. In its choice of particulars it adheres to St. Matthew, in its orderly arrangement it agrees with St. Luke. Its notes of geography imply a special adaptation to readers in Palestine, while the passage chap. vii. shows a partial exposition of Jewish rites for Gentile readers. This transitional character is doubly fulfilled in the name and history of John Mark. His name is Jewish, but he has a Roman surname, which gradually supersedes it. He is linked, first with St. Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, then with Paul and Barnabas in the first Gentile circuit, then with Peter, and lastly with Paul again. His history is one of transition, and thus answers closely to the peculiar character of the second gospel.

Mark's failure at Perga would not disqualify him for the work.

X. The partial cloud, which seems to rest on John Mark in the Book of Acts, may be thought a reason for denying him to be the writer of the gospel. But a closer inquiry will turn this objection into a presumption for the identity. The evangelist, it appears alike from his work and from uniform tradition, was the companion of St. Peter, and his son in the faith. But St. Peter himself, with all his zeal and strong faith, repeatedly failed with reference to the call of the Gentiles. When the vision was given him, his answer showed the strength of his early Jewish associations—"Not so, Lord, for I have never tasted any thing common or unclean." Again, when he came to Antioch, soon after the council, "he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision." Now the failure of John Mark merely exhibits the same tendency in a mitigated form. He did not keep pace with the glowing zeal and ever onward progress of the apostle of the Gentiles ; and returned to Jerusalem, to strengthen existing churches, instead of carrying the gospel on to the idolatrous heathen of Pisidia and Pamphylia. Even Barnabas, with all his love to his nephew, seems to have owned in practice the force of

Paul's objection, since he sailed to Cyprus, where Mark had really accompanied them on the former journey. The fault of Mark seems thus to have been, a backwardness to apprehend the special glory of the gospel as a message of grace to the Gentiles, and a preference for the less arduous work of building up the churches already formed. Yet the apostle, at a later period, commends him as one of the few teachers of the circumcision who had been a comfort to him at Rome. This spiritual analogy between John Mark and the Apostle Peter, in their main temptation, and their final victory, tends rather to confirm the usual view, that the former was the author of the second gospel.

XI. The associations of John Mark, if only we are allowed to conjecture from his surname that his father was a Roman Jew, and that he was early acquainted with many Roman residents of Jerusalem and Cæsarea, will agree perfectly with all the features of the gospel. The Jewish character is in some respects more prominent than even in St. Matthew, as in the mention of Abiathar the high priest (ii. 26), the name, Boanerges (iii. 17), the words, Talitha Cumi (v. 41), the mention of Bethsaida, Gennesaret and Dalmanutha (vi. 45, 53; viii. 10), the words, Corban and Ephphatha (vii. 11, 34), the mention of Bartimæus, the son of Timæus (x. 46), the house of Simon the leper (xiv. 3), the Syriac word, Abba (xiv. 36), and the mention of the Preparation (xv. 42).

His name suggests descent from a Roman Jew.

It has been inferred, indeed, from vii. 3 ("for all the Jews except they wash . . . eat not"), that the writer was a Gentile. But a comparison of the gospels will prove that there is no ground for this conclusion, since this mention of "the Jews" occurs only twice in St. Luke, and more than twenty times in St. John's gospel. Or if stress be laid on the combination "all the Jews," it occurs elsewhere only in the speech of St. Paul, a Jew, when addressing an audience of Gentiles. It therefore agrees best with the supposition that St. Mark was a Jew, who was addressing himself in this passage to Gentile readers.

Again, the distinctive Latinisms of this gospel, *κεντυρίων*, *σπεκουλάτωρ*, *σύσσημον*, *αὔλη*, *ὃ ἐστι πραιτώριον*, and *δύο*

λεπτά, ὃ ἐστὶ κοδράντης, all suit with the idea that St. Mark was a Roman Jew, addressing himself to converts from among the Roman military, like Cornelius and his household, and cannot reasonably be held to prove that he was himself either a Gentile or a soldier. It may be observed, also, that the allusions to the apostles and the women, in this gospel, imply an early and familiar acquaintance, and have not at all the air we should expect in a recent convert from among the Gentiles. But the home of John Mark was at Jerusalem, and he would clearly be familiar with most of the disciples, whose names appear in this work, with Mary the mother of James, Mary Magdalene and Salome, and probably with Bartimeus and Joseph of Arimathea.

His mention of
the women.

XII. The mention of the women serves, perhaps, to throw light on the date of the gospel. "There were women looking on, among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome." In St. Matthew we read—"among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children." Again we read in St. Mark, "And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid." It seems probable, from the slight change, that Zebedee was known to the first evangelist, but not to the second; and that Salome was alive, or but lately dead, when the second gospel was written. The mother of James and John must have been nearly fifty during our Lord's lifetime, and hence it seems likely that the gospel was composed within twenty years of the Crucifixion. The name, James the less, to distinguish the son of Alphaeus from the son of Zebedee, implies also a date not long after the elder James had suffered martyrdom, and while both the apostles of that name were alike prominent in the minds of Christians. The same reason accounts for the title "the mother of Joses" in the other verse. In choosing the briefest description, the writer mentions the son whose name would have no ambiguity, since "the mother of James," without some addition, would confound her with Salome, the mother of the elder James, and of John his brother.

XIII. The mention of Joseph of Arimathea, in the four gospels, has an instructive difference. "There came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph" (Matt. xxvii. 57). "Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable counsellor, who also waited for the kingdom of God" (Mark xv. 43). "And behold, there was a man named Joseph, a counsellor, a good man and just; he was of Arimathea, a city of the Jews, who also himself waited for the kingdom of God" (Luke xxiii. 50, 51). "And after this, Joseph of Arimathea, a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews," etc. (John xix. 30).

Of Joseph of Arimathea.

Here St. Mark and St. John allude to the person and place as equally well known. St. Matthew assumes the place to be known, but not the person, and St. Luke implies that both alike might be unknown to his readers. The form in St. Matthew may perhaps be explained by the secret and constant reference to the prophecies. He therefore mentions first his character, "a rich man," by which the words of Isaiah were fulfilled, and adds his name, as of secondary importance, to be merely a pledge of historical accuracy. St. Luke evidently wrote for persons who were not familiar with the person of Joseph, or with the minute geography of Judea. The language of St. Mark, like that of St. John, implies a familiar knowledge of the town, Arimathea, and some personal acquaintance with Joseph himself. And clearly one of the honourable counsellors, who had become so early a disciple of Jesus, must have been known to John Mark, whose home had been for many years in the heart of Jerusalem.

XIV. We are told, in this gospel, that Simon the Cyrenian was coming "out of the country" when he was compelled to bear the cross, and that the two disciples were "going into the country" when Jesus appeared to them. The phrase occurs elsewhere once in St. Luke only, where it seems merely borrowed from St. Mark (xxiii. 26). Such a phrase, for the vicinity of Jerusalem, agrees well with the fact that John Mark had his home in that city, not far from the prison of Herod. In St. Matthew, who was a Galilean, the expression is not found.

Of "the country," as a term for the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

Of Bartimeus
and Timeus.

XV. The mention of blind Bartimeus, the son of Timeus, x. 46, and of Simon the leper, xiv. 3, would naturally lead us to think that they were both alive, and known to the writer. At a distance of eighteen years from the Crucifixion this would be very probable, but this probability is greatly diminished if the gospel be assigned to a much later period.

All imply an
early date or
knowledge of
Jerusalem.

All these indications agree with the view that the second gospel was written by John Mark, about the year A.D. 48, and probably at Casarea, with a reference, not only to Jewish believers, but to Gentile Roman converts, who would have multiplied there in seven or eight years from the conversion of Cornelius. The mother of James, and Salome, Joseph of Arimathea, Bartimeus, and Simon the leper, might all of them be then alive, or their memory fresh and recent in the minds of the Christians of Palestine. The Roman surname of St. Mark, his home at Jerusalem, and return thither, and his later eminent labours at Rome itself, make it likely that Casarea, the military station of the Romans, would be a main theatre of his ministry at this time. His gospel, if written in A.D. 48, or 49, would be probably known to St. Luke at Antioch, after the visit of Peter and Mark, which followed the council, a little before the circuit of Paul and Silas began. In harmony with this view, we find St. Paul, with his dying breath, associate him honourably with his brother evangelist, as one of his choicest helpers. "Only Luke is with me. Take Mark and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me for the ministry."

But would
St. Paul have
refused him
at Antioch
(Acts xv.) if
he were then
already the
author of a
gospel?

An objection to this view may perhaps be raised, from the passage Acts xv. 38, where St. Paul, after the council, refuses John Mark for his companion in a second missionary journey. Is it likely that one, thus rejected by the apostle, should have been selected by the Spirit of God, shortly before, to be the writer of a gospel in which the main and prominent feature is the laborious and persevering diligence of our Saviour's ministry?

The difficulty
met.

This difficulty has already been examined, and partly removed. St. Peter, whose interpreter Mark is often said to

be, with all his excellencies and endowments, was yet guilty of one serious inconsistency, nearly at the same time with the dispute of Paul and Barnabas, and his fault brought upon him a grave and public rebuke from his brother apostle not long before his refusal of Mark for his partner in the journey. If that error of St. Peter was compatible with his high calling, as one of the very chief apostles, the fault of John Mark must be equally compatible with his lower, yet important privilege, as the least conspicuous of the four evangelists. The source of the error, in both cases, was evidently the same. St. Mark, a Jew of Jerusalem, like St. Peter, his father in the faith, was too slow in apprehending the full extent of the duties imposed on Christians by the new development of gospel liberty, in the call of the Gentiles. As Peter dissembled at Antioch, when the Christian Pharisees came down from James, and shrank from the consistent uniformity of his former intercourse with the Gentiles, so also St. Mark seems to have shrunk from the course of rapid extension, which the gospel was receiving among heathen idolaters by St. Paul's energy, and preferred the less adventurous work of building up the converts in Palestine. The free standing of the Gentile converts had not yet been publicly ratified by a solemn council, and St. Mark seems to have had the willingness for patient labour, without the prompt discernment of the higher lessons of Providence, and of the new era which was opening on the Church of Christ. When once the principle of Gentile liberty had been confirmed, there is no trace to be seen of any slackness in his zeal. He is willing to go with Paul and Barnabas, and when rejected by the former, with Barnabas alone. Some time, perhaps not long afterward, St. Paul gives a charge to the Phrygian and other churches to receive him, as being already satisfied of his zeal and fidelity. Still later, he is found with St. Peter in the east, as one of his most loved and honoured helpers; and still later again, with St. Paul at Rome, in the crisis of his imprisonment; who mentions him, along with two others, as the only Jewish teachers who had been a signal help and comfort to him in his ministry. So deep was the impres-

sion made on the apostle by his conduct and diligence, that in his last imprisonment, a few months before his death, when only Luke was present with him, he is not content with sending for his beloved son, Timothy, but requires him to bring Mark also along with him, because he found such help and comfort in his services and labours. The defect in St. Mark, while it lasted, like the similar fault of St. Peter, under whose eye he wrote, was not such as to disqualify him from great immediate usefulness, or from the task of recording faithfully the teaching and labours of the Lord Jesus. It showed, at the most, some deficiency in those wider sympathies with humanity at large which characterize St. Luke's writings, or in that clearness and elevation of spiritual vision, with regard to the highest mysteries of providence and grace, which mark the beloved disciple that leaned once on the bosom of the Lord.

On the other hand, there are several features in the history of John Mark which would eminently qualify him for the task he was selected to fulfil. He must have been very intimate with St. Peter, who calls first at his house, when released from prison by the angel, and who styles him afterwards his son in the faith. He was not less intimate with Barnabas, his own uncle, the most distinguished of all the converts added to the church after the day of Pentecost, and before the call of the Gentiles. It is possible that he might be one of the brethren who accompanied Peter on his visit to Cornelius, and almost certain that he was present in Jerusalem when St. Peter gave in his report to the church. He had already, at the date to which the gospel has just been referred, accompanied the apostle of the Gentiles on the outset of his first journey, and was to be presently associated, in succession, with Barnabas, with Peter, and with Paul again. He would thus occupy precisely a middle position, in his early connection with the church, and in his mixed associations (implied in his very names,) as a Jew by birth, and a Roman by character, between the first evangelist, who was one of the twelve apostles, and the third, who has been shown to be a Gentile

proselyte of the great Gentile city, Antioch. There would thus be a provision made, even in the choice of the writers, as well as in the time when each of them wrote, for the gradual development of Christian doctrine, and the transition from the summing up of all ancient Jewish prophecy, in the king of Israel, to the fuller and wider view of our Lord's character and work, as the son of the first Adam, who was himself the second Adam, the friend of sinners, and Redeemer of mankind.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE DATE AND AUTHENTICITY OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

Historic probability points to a date about A.D. 42.

FROM the order of the gospels, determined by their mutual relations to each other, and the dates already assigned to those of St. Mark and St. Luke, it will naturally follow that the first gospel was written earlier than A.D. 48, and probably during the first of the three periods in the church's history, contained in the Book of Acts, or before the death of Herod Agrippa.

It is not likely that a written gospel would appear within six or seven years from the Ascension, while the apostles were all present in Jerusalem, and busied in the direct work of oral instruction, and at a time when nearly all the converts in Judea and Galilee might have a direct and personal knowledge of our Lord's ministry. But these reasons would no longer apply, when the first era of the church was drawing to a close. At the death of Herod, fourteen years would have passed since the Ascension, and eighteen from the opening of John's ministry. One half of the converts might have been only children when Jesus was on earth ; so that a narrative of his discourses for their use would become desirable, and when the apostles were scattered by persecution, almost necessary. The words of Peter, on his release from prison, xii. 17 ("Tell these things unto James and to the brethren"), seem to imply that no apostle but James was then in Jerusalem. There is an early tradition that our Lord charged his apostles to stay at Jerusalem twelve years, and then to go forth to the heathen, and such an idea agrees well with the tenor of St. Luke's history.

The apostles were still in Judea after the conversion of Cornelius, A.D. 41,¹ but three years later, after the death of James the son of Zebedee, only James the Lord's brother, beside Peter, seems to have remained. If the conversion of Cornelius, and the call of the Gentiles, were viewed by them as the preparation for entering on a wider sphere, this would form a new motive for recording the discourses and miracles of Jesus, both for the use of the converts in Palestine, and for a testimony to the unbelieving Jews. Hence the year A.D. 42 may be viewed with reason as a near approach to the date of this first gospel. Let us examine the external and internal evidence, which either opposes or favours this conclusion.

There are several authorities which agree in assigning the gospel an early date. Cosmas of Alexandria places it in the persecution which followed the death of Stephen; Isidore, in the reign of Caligula, which ended A.D. 41; and Theophylact and Euthymius, in the eighth year from the Ascension.² All these are a little earlier than the date proposed above. But Irenæus seems to place this gospel much later, and his authority has led many modern critics, as Lardner, Mill, and Michaelis, to the same view. His words are as follows.

Some writers place it earlier, but Irenæus much later. We are thrown back upon internal evidence, which points to early origin.

"Now Matthew, among the Hebrews, published also a written gospel, while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome, and founding the church there. But after their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also delivered to us in writing what was preached by Peter, and Luke, the follower of Paul, recorded in a book the gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, the same who leaned on his breast, set forth a gospel whilst he resided at Ephesus in Asia." (Iren., "Hær.," iii. 1, p. 174.)

Here it is plain that Irenæus dates the second and third

¹ Acts xi. 1. Perhaps the inference that the apostolic circle was unbroken is too wide. At St. Paul's first visit he only *saw* Peter and James, the brother of the Lord.—ED.

² Cosmas, p. 245; Isidore, "Chronicon. Migne," t. vi. p. 89; Theophylact, "Præf. in Matt.," see pp. 1 and 2.

gospels after the death of the two apostles; a view inconsistent with the fact, that St. Paul quotes the gospel of St. Luke in his own lifetime (St. Luke x. 7; 1 Tim. v. 18), while the Book of Acts was evidently composed before his last journey and final imprisonment. The remark that St. Matthew wrote in Palestine, while St. Peter and St. Paul were preaching at Rome, has the air of a loose antithesis rather than of an exact definition of time. If Irenæus is wrong, where he speaks with precision, very little weight can be reasonably given to his more indefinite statement with regard to St. Matthew's gospel. The general impression of early writers, that it was first written in Hebrew, is a presumption of at least equal force in favour of a higher date, and we are thus thrown upon the internal evidence to fix the time of its composition.

1. The Baptist introduced abruptly as well known.

I. The mention of John the Baptist is a first presumption for its early origin. He is introduced abruptly as follows.

St. Matt. iii. 1: "In those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. For he it is that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias," etc.

St. Matt. iv. 12: "Now when Jesus had heard that John was delivered up, he departed into Galilee."

St. Matt. xi. 2: "Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Jesus, he sent two of his disciples," etc.

Here the person of John, and the fact of his imprisonment by Herod, are assumed to be well known, and familiar to the reader. This brief mention is quite natural, if his public appearance was only sixteen years before the date of the gospel. The general facts of his appearance, preaching, and sudden imprisonment, would be known to every reader in Palestine. But if the gospel were written forty years after that imprisonment, the facts would surely have been stated in a more distinct and historical form, as we find them given in the gospel of St. Luke. The abrupt introduction is more striking in the case of the imprisonment, and would be quite natural, if the work were published only three or four years after Herod was deposed.

II. The three other gospels, in their account of the crucifixion, constantly use the name of Pilate, and never his title of office. St. Matthew uses the title, governor, and the name, Pilate, with equal frequency, since each of them occurs nine times. Now Pilate held the office ten years, and after his removal, A.D. 36, no successor with the same title was appointed, until Cuspius Fadus, after the death of Agrippa, A.D. 44, when three governors succeeded within five years. The use of the name and the office, as equivalent and convertible, would thus be natural, not only till the deposition of Pilate, but until Agrippa's death. But when Fadus, Tiberius Alexander, Cumanus, and Felix, one or more of them, had held the same office, the use of the title, governor, as equivalent to the name of Pilate, would naturally become less frequent. It might still be employed once or twice, for variety, or where the mention of his rank was emphatic, but the usage which marks the first gospel could hardly have survived the new appointments.

2. The use of the word ἡγέμων, or "governor," for Pilate.

This argument is confirmed by comparing Matt. xxvii. 15, "At that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would," with Mark xv. 5, 6, "Now at that feast he was wont to release them a prisoner, whomsoever they desired. And the multitude, crying aloud, began to desire that he would do as he had ever done to them." The word *governor*, in the former gospel, is plainly equivalent to the name Pilate in the second. If a governor were ruling Judea when Matthew wrote, and the custom still continued, the present tense would naturally be used, "Now at that feast the governor is wont." If there were another governor, and the custom was obsolete, it would be natural either to speak of Pilate by name, or to use an adverb of time. "At that feast Pilate was wont," or "the governor was *then* wont," etc. As the passage now stands, it is a strong presumption that the gospel was written before another governor had succeeded to Pilate's office, or before the middle of A.D. 44, the limit already assigned for an entirely different reason. During Herod Agrippa's reign, the title governor, and the name Pilate, would still be strictly equivalent to Jewish ears.

3. The phrase "unto this day" applied to the naming of the "field of blood," and the report of the watch.

III. There are two passages which have been adduced in proof of a later date; where it is said of the potter's field, "That field is called the field of blood unto this day" (St. Matt. xxvii. 8), and again of the soldiers' report, "This saying is commonly reported among the Jews unto this day" (St. Matt. xxviii. 15). But an interval of twelve years is really enough to account for each of these expressions.

First, in the case of Judas. The same field is clearly meant (Acts. i. 18, 19), for it is incredible that two different fields, at the very same time, should have the same new title imposed, close to Jerusalem. It was actually bought by the priests after the death of Judas, being the same in which he had committed suicide, and was called *Aceldama*. in the dialect of Jerusalem, but *ἄγρος ἁμαρτος* by Matthew, and *χωρίον ἁμαρτος* by St. Luke. Now if such a singular name, occasioned by the awful end of Judas, had continued in use for twelve years, and was current daily among the Jews themselves when St. Matthew wrote, it would be quite natural for him to mention the fact, just as he has done. "Wherefore that field was called the field of blood, unto this day." There is certainly nothing in the phrase which requires a longer interval than ten or twelve years. In the Book of Acts this addition is not found, so that it is quite uncertain whether the name were still in use when St. Luke wrote his second work. If it were still in use the difference may be explained by the different place where the two works were written. St. Matthew alone wrote in or near Jerusalem, so that it would be more natural for him to mention that the name was still in current use in that city.

A similar remark will apply to the other passage. "Palpable lies," as Dr. Townson observes, "and new names of places, which have had others from ancient usage, are things of such a perishable nature, that even a single year might give propriety to the observation. It was memorable that the name had fastened on the field, and strange that the lie had lasted so long."

But the passage, when examined further, will even furnish evidence in favour of the earlier date, proposed above. The

whole circumstance, of the watch at the sepulchre, with the consultation of the Sanhedrim, the bribery of the soldiers, and the report still current among the Jews, is mentioned in this gospel alone. Now it is plain that, beside the direct evidence of the apostles to the fact of the resurrection, from the repeated appearances of their Lord, there was a further evidence in the setting of the watch, and the disappearance of the body, with a counter-evidence in the report of the guards, if the secret cause of it were unknown. This evidence and counter-evidence would be limited to the vicinity of Jerusalem, and would have less and less weight as the minute particulars became less notorious, or after the lapse of many years, while the direct and simple testimony of the disciples would continue unaffected by these limitations of place and time. And hence the fact that this gospel alone records the watch, and the report spread among the Jews, implies naturally that it was written earlier than the others, when the fact of the watch being set was most likely to confirm the evidence of the resurrection, from being familiarly known; and when the counter-explanation, being also well known, would stand most in need of refutation by a simple, unadorned statement of the events themselves. The whole passage bears the traces of a period when the historical fact of the resurrection was still the prominent subject of contention, and when the tide of Jewish opposition had not begun to spend its main force on another topic, the transfer of their exclusive privileges to the Gentiles. As to the internal incongruities of the account, alleged by Strauss and other neologian critics, they have no real existence, and are based on a gross misconception of a very clear and simple statement.

IV. The following verses, Matt. xxviii. 16-18, present another mark of an early date, very easily overlooked, but not the less convincing, when fairly weighed. The words are these: "Then went away the eleven disciples into Galilee, into the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came near and spake to them, saying, All power is given to me in heaven and earth."

4. The notice of the mountain in Galilee which Jesus "had appointed them."

Here the evangelist alludes to the circumstance, as already known, that Jesus had appointed for his disciples to meet him in some particular mountain of Galilee. No mention of this appointment occurs elsewhere, either in this gospel or in the others. But we learn from 1 Cor. xv. 6, that he appeared, no doubt in Galilee, to above five hundred brethren at once; and this appearance, as being the most public and notorious, is doubtless the one which St. Matthew here records. It is equally clear that so large a number could not have been gathered together for such a purpose without a previous appointment, and that such an appointment could be made only by our Lord himself. Since most of these brethren were alive twenty-seven years later, when St. Paul wrote, it is clear that this appearance must have been the most prominent in the faith and memory of the Jewish believers. Hence the exclusive reference to it in St. Matthew's gospel. But his allusion to our Lord's appointment of the place, as a fact already known, shows that he viewed his narrative as a supplementary statement, and that many circumstances, from personal knowledge, or the oral communication of the apostles, were still fresh in the minds of his readers. Twelve years after the Ascension he might reasonably assume that most converts in Palestine were aware of the specific appointment of our Lord, and of the spot where it was fulfilled, since four hundred living eye-witnesses were dispersed in every part of the land. But at the distance of thirty years, the same assumption would be out of place; and, accordingly, no trace of it appears in any of the other gospels. A similar explanation applies to the words that follow; "but some doubted." It seems clear, from the statement of St. Paul, that five hundred disciples were present, besides the eleven, and to these St. Matthew probably refers.

5. The use of the term "gospel."

V. The use of the word gospel, as Dr. Townson has remarked, is a sign of the earlier date of St. Matthew's narrative. It is there used only four times, thrice in the complex phrase, the gospel of the kingdom (St. Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35; xxiv. 13), and once in the words respecting Mary, and her anointing: "Wheresoever this gospel shall be

preached in the whole world " (St. Matt. xxvi. 14). Hence it has clearly not assumed its technical sense, but denotes simply *the glad tidings*, or *these glad tidings*. In St. Mark, however, it occurs eight times, and in six cases in its abstract form : Mark i. 15 ; viii. 35 ; x. 29 ; xiii. 10 ; xiv. 9 ; xvi. 15. It is plain that, when this evangelist wrote, the secondary meaning was becoming established, in which it is a synonym for the Christian revelation.

It is true that the entire absence of the word in St. Luke may seem, at first, to oppose this conclusion. But this contrast may easily be explained, since he uses the verb *εὐαγγελίζομαι* ten times in the gospel, and fifteen times in the Book of Acts, which is never used by St. Mark or St. John, and only once in St. Matthew. This merely proves that St. Luke, writing for Gentile converts, avoided a technical term, and preferred a more classical equivalent, and does not prove that the technical use of the word had not then begun. In fact, it occurs twice in the Book of Acts, and eight times in the epistles to Thessalonica, which must have been as early, or almost as early, as the third gospel. And hence the conclusion remains undisturbed, that the term had acquired its more limited acceptance when St. Mark's gospel was written, but had scarcely begun to receive it when the other and earlier gospel was composed.

VI. In the phrases used to describe the apostles, St. Matthew's gospel gives another sign of its early date. They are called, in chapter x., *the twelve disciples*, *the twelve apostles*, and *these twelve* ; and afterwards they are twice named *the twelve disciples* ; three times in chapter xxvi. *the twelve* ; once *the eleven disciples*, and nearly sixty times, without further addition, *the disciples*. In St. Mark, the expression, *the twelve*, is used nine times, the title, *Apostles*, once, and the term, *disciples*, about forty times. In St. Luke, *the twelve* is used five times, *the twelve disciples*, and *the twelve apostles*, once, and *the apostles* five times ; while in the Book of Acts, *the twelve* is used once, and the word, *apostles*, thirty times. Hence it appears that, in all the history, before the last supper, the brief expression, *the*

ε. The designation of "the Twelve."

twelve, is used five times by St. Mark, and three times by St. Luke, and never by St. Matthew; while the term, *apostles*, without addition, is used once by St. Mark, five times by St. Luke in the gospel, thirty times in the Acts, and never once by St. Matthew. Now this clearly indicates, not only that St. Matthew's gospel was the earliest written, but that it was composed when the new term, *apostles*, had not yet displaced the earlier description of the twelve disciples, and when the abbreviation, *the twelve*, was itself hardly established as the most familiar and usual term. Such a feature, though minute, is entirely opposed to the date of some critics, thirty years and more after the crucifixion, and agrees well with the time of its composition which is here maintained, about twelve years after the close of the gospel history. Even this interval might appear too long for the usage to be thus undetermined, if we did not remember that a writer, who was himself an apostle, both from habit and from modesty, would adhere more generally than another to the original expression.

7. The titles of honour applied to Jerusalem.

VII. The titles of honour, applied to Jerusalem in this gospel alone, are not only a sign that it was written for Jewish readers, but the probable indication of an early date. Twice it is called "the holy city" (St. Matt. iv. 5; xxvii. 53), once, "the city of the great King" (St. Matt. v. 35), and once its vicinity is called, "the holy place" (St. Matt. xxiv. 15), in the report of our Lord's prophecy. This last instance is the more remarkable, since it disappears in the account of the same discourse, both in St. Mark and St. Luke. So long as the parting charge of our Lord, "beginning at Jerusalem," was still in force, the feeling of its sanctity would be rather increased than diminished by the new revelation, of which it was still the chosen theatre. But when the slaughter of prophets and apostles had begun, and the gospel was spreading its blessed influence to other cities, in a higher measure, it was natural that Jerusalem should more and more decline in the estimation of believers; or to speak more correctly, that its sin rather than its sanctity should be noted by the Spirit of God. Hence the contrast between the first gospel and the two

others agrees with the view, that the persecution of Herod Agrippa, the martyrdom of James, the miraculous escape of Peter, and the dispersion of the other apostles, had intervened between the earlier and the two later narratives.

VIII. The mention of the sons of Zebedee is a further sign that this gospel was written early. The foot-note will show the relative frequency of the different names in the three gospels, and the Book of Acts.¹

8. The mention of the sons of Zebedee.

There is here an evident progression. Zebedee, and his eldest son, James, are most prominent in the first gospel, the two brothers, especially James, in the second, but in the third gospel, and still more in the Book of Acts, John has precedence of his brother. This greater prominence of James, in the second gospel, tends to confirm the proposed date, about four years only after his death; while the more frequent mention of his brother, not only in the Book of Acts, but in the gospel of St. Luke, is quite natural in a writer who lived and wrote at Antioch, after the first council, in which Peter, and John and James the less, were the recognized pillars of the church, and seven years after the martyrdom of the elder brother.

Again, the frequent mention of Zebedee, in the first gospel, agrees well with a date only twelve years after the Ascension, or fifteen from the call of his two sons, when he was still alive. On the other hand, it would be unnatural more than thirty years after his death, when the Apostle John had been so long prominent as one of the main pillars of the Church of Christ. At such a date the proportion is natural, which we find in St. Luke's gospel, or in the Book of Acts, but not the other. Why, indeed, should the father be named so often, and the sons and the

	Matthew.	Mark.	Luke.	Acts.
¹ Zebedee	6	4	1	0
Sons of Zebedee . .	2	2	1	0
James	3	10	5	2
John	3	10	7	9
James and John . .	3	9	3-4	1 (?)
John and James . .	0	0	1-2	1 (?)
John, brother of James .	3	3	0	0
James, brother of John .	0	0	0	1

mother described so often by their relation to him, if Zebedee were not better known to many of the first readers of the gospel than the apostles themselves? After the death of James, new habits of thought would soon arise, the sons be more notorious than their father Zebedee, and John more prominent in the minds of Christians than his elder brother.

9. The titles of
St. Simon and
St. Jude.

IX. The lists of the apostles furnish another sign that St. Matthew wrote very early. In his gospel, and that of St. Mark, Simon is styled the Canaanite,¹ but in the third gospel and Acts, Zelotes, the Greek version of the same title. As Peter replaced Cephas, so Zelotes would probably replace "Canaanites," as the more usual appellation, and especially with the Greek converts out of Palestine. The brother of James, in Matthew, is Lebbeus, surnamed Thaddeus; in Mark, Thaddeus; but in St. Luke, Judas, the brother of James, and in St. John, Judas not Iscariot. From this last mention of him, and from his own epistle, it is clear that the name Judas came later into common use, and continued to the close of the century. Since Judas is not a Greek, but a Jewish name, this is a clearer proof than the last, that St. Luke wrote after the two other evangelists. While Iscariot lived, there would be a motive for calling this apostle by some other name, and the fact that Judas Barsabas was an eminent prophet of the mother church, might perhaps prolong this usage. When St. Mark wrote, the name Lebbeus appears almost lost in the surname, Thaddeus; when St. Luke wrote, both had been replaced by the name Judas. Hence the earlier we place St. Matthew's gospel, the fuller will be the explanation of this difference. The name Lebbeus probably began to be disused after the death of Judas Iscariot, and seems quite extinct when the Book of Acts and St. Jude's Epistle were written.

10. The notice
of Simon the
leper and
Simon the
Cyrenian.

X. The passage xxvi. 6, compared with xxvii. 32, seems to imply an early date. Simon the leper, and his house, are introduced as already well known. On the other hand,

¹ The A.V. Canaanite is misleading; the Greek is *κανανίτης*, from Hebrew נָפִץ, "to be jealous."—ED.

Simon the Cyrenian is described as a stranger. This Cyrenian Jew would be a foreigner in Jerusalem, and therefore be less likely to be known to readers in Palestine. But Simon the leper might very probably be still living at the house in Bethany, at the distance of twelve years from the Crucifixion. After thirty, or thirty-five years, it is most likely that he would be dead, and his person unknown to nine-tenths of the Jewish Christians.

XI. The partial irregularity which has been shown to exist in the first gospel, is some guide to its probable date. An eye-witness, writing soon after the events, would have to select out of a very large number of incidents or discourses; and his account would therefore seem, to his own mind, less rigidly bound by the laws of continuous narrative. He would think it more important to give prominence to some leading features in our Lord's ministry, than to adhere to the order of time, when the events he had to relate were few, compared with many others, which he passed by in silence. This special purpose, however, would soon cease, and the instincts of simple narrative would resume their full influence, and dictate an adherence, wherever it was known, to the actual succession in which the incidents occurred.

Now the irregular portion of St. Matthew has features which agree thoroughly with this supposition. First, in the Sermon on the Mount, it exhibits at considerable length the moral code of the Christian Church under the new revelation. Next, in the Commission of the Apostles, it reveals the law of its progress, and the provision made for its future development. Thirdly, in chapter xi., it exhibits its relations, retrospectively, to the law, the prophets, the baptism of John, and the unbelieving people of Israel. From this point the writer resumes the order of time, having now placed in the fore-front the main constituent elements of our Lord's ministry, and of the gospel dispensation. Such an arrangement would be more natural than a rigid adherence to the order of the incidents in the first written history of our Lord; which would be a kind of manifesto to the whole nation of the Jews, and a manual

11. The partial chronological irregularity of narrative.

of their faith to the first generation of Jewish converts. It is evident, through the whole course of the gospel, that the exhibition of our Lord's doctrinal teaching is a more prominent aim of the writer, than the record of his miracles and journeys, the only exception being in the cardinal facts of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, on which all the higher doctrines of the faith would necessarily depend.

12. Minute allusions to incidents and places as familiar.

XII. There are several minute allusions in the gospel, which prove that the readers for whom it was designed were supposed, many of them, to be familiar with many local circumstances and incidents of our Lord's personal ministry. In chapter v. 1, we are told that "seeing the multitudes he went up into the mountain," although no mountain has been specified before. If, however, many of the readers were present, or knew of a particular mountain near to Capernaum, or if it were the same, where Jesus met the disciples after his resurrection, any of these suppositions would account for the phrase, while they all would alike imply an early date of the composition. In chapter viii. 18, we are told that he "gave commandment to depart unto the other side"; and again, verse 23, that "when he was entered into the ship, his disciples followed him." The former phrase implies that he wrote for readers acquainted with the situation of the sea of Tiberias, and the latter, that they were aware of the fact, mentioned by St. Mark, that a small ship or boat was retained for the special use of Jesus and his disciples.¹ The same allusion recurs, chapter xiii. 1, and xiv. 22, and the mountain is mentioned once more, chapter xv. 29. The retirement into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi is not mentioned explicitly, as in St. Mark, nor omitted entirely, as in St. Luke, but stated incidentally. "And when Jesus was come into the coast of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples," etc. (St. Matt. xvi. 13). In the same manner the stay in Galilee, and the return to Capernaum, chapter xvii. 22, 24, which the gospel of St. Mark restores to the direct historical form. The same feature appears in the mention

¹ The reading on which this argument is founded is doubtful in the first two cases; and, in the last, the insertion of the article serves to specify the ship already mentioned in xiv. 13.—ED.

of the last journey, chapter xx. 17: "And Jesus, as he went up to Jerusalem, took the twelve disciples apart in the way." So in verse 29: "And as they departed from Jericho, a great multitude followed him." And in chapter xxi. 1: "When they drew nigh to Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage to the Mount of Olives, Jesus sent two disciples." A comparison with St. Mark will make the contrast apparent, where the events are thus given: "And they departed thence, and passed through Galilee, and he would not have any man know it, for he taught his disciples," etc. (ix. 30). "And he came to Capernaum, and being in the house, he asked them" (ix. 33). "And they were on the way going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus went before them" (x. 32). "And they came to Jericho; and as he went out of Jericho with his disciples," etc. (x. 46). "And when they came nigh to Jerusalem, unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the Mount of Olives" (xi. 1). The form is thus changed in each instance except the last, where the context has shown the direction of the journey, and there Bethany is added, as if to make the account more perspicuous to a stranger.

This indirect mention of the events, in these journeys or local incidents, would be quite natural, if the gospel were written when most of the converts were personally aware of the general outline of our Lord's last journey; and hence they confirm the opinion that it was written early, before the time of Herod's death.

XIII. The frequent quotations from the prophets are a striking peculiarity of St. Matthew's gospel. The instances are very numerous: i. 22, 23; ii. 6, 15, 17; iii. 3; iv. 14-16; viii. 17; xi. 10; xii. 17, 18; xiii. 14, 35; xxi. 4-6, 13, 16; xxii. 44; xxvi. 31, 56; xxvii. 9, 10, 35.¹ Such a frequent appeal to the prophecies is most natural in a gospel addressed to the Jews, and written early in the course of the great controversy between the Church and the Synagogue. It appears equally in the first sermons in the Book of Acts, and would be more frequent and impressive at an early period

13. The character of the quotations from the ancient prophets.

¹ Some MSS. omit this verse.—ED.

of the conflict. The quotations, afterwards, turned rather on another question, whether the Gentiles were to share freely in the blessings of the promised Messiah. But on this subject not one quotation appears in the first gospel; they all relate to the personal history of the Lord Jesus. We may reasonably infer that it was written while the controversy with the Jews was confined mainly to the direct question of the Messiahship of Jesus, and when the admission of the Gentiles to share in the privileges of God's covenant had scarcely become a prominent subject of contention and debate. And this would be the case, if the gospel were composed A.D. 42, or only one year after the conversion of Cornelius.

14. The mention of the Herodians.

XIV. The mention of the Herodians by St. Matthew and St. Mark, is another feature which may throw light on the time of their composition. The term is not found in Josephus, and no explanation of it is given in the gospels. There has been, in consequence, a great diversity of judgment among modern critics as to its meaning. Some think they were a sodality in honour of Herod; others, his courtiers and soldiers, who paid tribute freely; others, a Jewish sect, who held Herod the Great to be the Messiah; others, a party who gave the same flattery to Herod Antipas; others, that they were the followers of Judas of Galilee, and others again, a sect who favoured Herod in his compliance with heathen usages. Others, finally, that they were a portion of the Sadducees in league with Herod.

Let us examine the four passages themselves, Matt. xxii. 16; Mark iii. 6; viii. 15; xii. 13, and compare them with the history of the times. In Mark viii. 15, where the disciples are told to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, and the leaven of Herod, the tetrarch is clearly meant, who was then alive, and not Herod the Great, who had been dead thirty years. This Herod our Lord elsewhere calls a fox, from his crafty policy. His exile was caused by Caligula's strong suspicion, resting on weighty evidence, that he was preparing for a revolt from the Romans. If so, his interest would lead him to flatter the Pharisees, the popular leaders of the Jews, who seem from Luke xiii. 31,

32, to have been acquainted with some of his secret counsels. Accordingly the Herodians are always joined with the Pharisees, and in Matthew are plainly contrasted with the Sadducees. Two parties successively tempt Jesus, the Pharisees and the Herodians, then the Sadducees, and then the Pharisees alone. The second time they propose a riddle of theology, just as before, a question of political duty. We may infer that the Herodians were political Pharisees, who cared less for the law of Moses than for national independence, and fixed their hopes on the tetrarch, as the most hopeful leader of revolt, being probably admitted to some knowledge of his secret designs. Hence the double warning of Jesus does not refer to Sadduceeism, which was not the temptation of the disciples, but to Pharisaism religious and political. In one class, the leaven was self-righteous hypocrisy; in the other, the hypocrisy of outward submission and secret rebellion, in a proud aspiration after national independence.

It is now easy to explain why no mention of the Herodians should be found in Josephus, or even in the two later gospels. The exile of the tetrarch would crush their hopes, so far as they looked to him to be their leader in revolt. On the mad attempt of Caligula to place his statue in the temple, the conspiracy took new forms, with new provocations, sought for itself new leaders, and issued in a series of chronic and constant rebellions. The title would soon expire, since the disaffected, after Herod's exile, would seek to dissociate their cause from his name. And hence it would only be used, it seems likely, for a short period after that event, at least without some explanation of its meaning.

Now this confirms the proposed date of the first gospel, only three years after the voyage of Antipas to Rome, and his banishment by Caligula. The name would then be fresh in the minds of every Jewish reader, and continue intelligible in Palestine, even at the date of the second gospel, about six years later. But if we place them both, as Lardner and other critics have done, about A.D. 64, twenty-five years after Herod was banished, when the sect had long disappeared, and repeated revolts had occurred

under other leaders, the name would assuredly have had some explanatory addition, as the Sadducees receive in all the three gospels. And this would be the more needful, because the name itself is so ambiguous, and might be derived from Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, or Herod Agrippa.

15. Brief summary of argument, and concluding coincidence.

XV. Thus all the delicate and minute indications, contained in the first gospel, conspire in the same result, and fix its composition shortly before the death of the third Herod. There is also, on this view of its date, just at the time, probably, of a first dispersion of the apostles, and one or two years after the conversion of Cornelius, a beautiful agreement between the circumstances under which it was written, and that emphatic commission at its close, which they were about to fulfil: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world" (St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). A few years later, at the date assigned above to the second gospel, the notice of the actual fulfilment of this commission would have become a no less appropriate close of the gospel narrative: "And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by signs following. Amen" (St. Mark xvi. 20).

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GREEK GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

FROM the internal evidence of the New Testament we have now arrived at the important conclusion that the first of the four gospels was written about the year A D. 42, or soon after the conversion of the Gentiles, and a little before the death of Herod Agrippa, and the martyrdom of James. It seems to follow at once that it is the genuine work of the apostle whose name it bears, since no work of that early date could have become current under his name unless it had been his own genuine writing.

The early date of Matthew's gospel establishes its authenticity.

This conclusion is further confirmed by some minute features of this gospel, which ratify and complete the evidence of its authority. These have been noticed, in a striking manner, by Da Costa, in his valuable work on the "Gospel Harmony," and have been partly indicated in the "Horæ Apostolicæ," and by various authors. (Da Costa "Four Witnesses," p. 10 and fg.; "Horæ Apostolicæ," p. 377.)

Internal evidence confirms it.

First, the list of the apostles has a minute and expressive variation. The fourth pair, in St. Mark and St. Luke, are Matthew and Thomas, but, in the first gospel, they appear in the reverse order, and with the added epithet—Thomas and Matthew *the publican* (St. Matt. x. 3). This peculiarity, so characteristic of modesty in St. Matthew himself, and so improbable in any other writer, is a sign that he is the real author.

Again, in this gospel alone, the publican called from the receipt of custom, an odious and despised occupation, is

doubly identified, by name and profession, with the Apostle St. Matthew. The two others, by mentioning his call under a different name (St. Mark ii. 14; cf. Luke v. 27), as "Levi, the son of Alphæus," have given no clue to this identity, which is thus revealed to us by the first gospel alone. Again, the first gospel omits all mention of the feast, and does not state that it was Matthew's own house where Jesus sat at meat when these striking words of mercy were uttered. The very manner in which the apostle is introduced in his own gospel, as "a man, named Matthew" (St. Matt. ix. 9), is another instance of the same modesty of tone, and a further token that Matthew himself was the writer of the first narrative.

These internal features, when combined with the early date already established by strong evidence, and with the constant voice of all antiquity, prove the authenticity of the first gospel. The closing words, and the fulness with which the commission of the apostles is given, may be viewed as a further and concurrent signs that the writer was one of the apostolic company.

The question of the language is more difficult. Tradition widely current that he wrote in Hebrew.

A more difficult inquiry remains, with regard to the language in which the gospel was first written. Ancient authors, with general consent, affirm that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew. Such is the statement of Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Cyril, Athanasius, Epiphanius; and Chrysostom speaks of it more doubtfully as a usual tradition.¹ Among modern critics, this has been maintained and denied with equal confidence, while several have held a middle hypothesis, that the apostle himself wrote successively in both languages. Among those who maintain that his gospel was written in Hebrew, there have been various conjectures as to the translator. Some have held it to be St. Mark, others St. James or St. John, and Jerome frankly owns that it is quite uncertain. The consequence has been, that the Greek gospel has both its authenticity and its authority not a little obscured. It becomes important to examine the evidence anew on this debated question of historical criticism.

¹ For fuller references, see the Appendix to the present book.

1. The first question must be, whether the external evidence for a Hebrew original is clear and decisive. Mr. Greswell affirms that "no matter of fact, which rests upon the faith of testimony, can be considered certain, if this be not so" (Greswell, "Harmony of the Gospels," vol. i. p. 125). On the other hand, the editor of Diodati observes that "if the records of history, and reasonings of logic, have any value, the books of the New Testament, from Matthew to the Apocalypse, were certainly Greek in the apostolic autographs. Tradition at third hand is of little value, and it is obvious that that of Papias is nothing more than the shadow of a shade." The truth lies rather between these opposite statements. But it is clear that Papias does not profess to have seen this Hebrew original, nor does any one else, in later times, appear to have seen it, though Origen and Jerome¹ were diligent Hebrew students; and it is certainly difficult to believe that an inspired book has entirely perished, and left no trace of itself, except a translation by an unknown hand.

1. Is the external evidence decisive?

The words of Papias, in Eusebius, are these: *Μαθθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο· ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἐδύνατο ἕκαστος* (Pap. apud Euseb. "Hist. Ecc.," III. xxxix.). This is followed by the statement that St. Mark also wrote a gospel, but *ὃν μέντοι τάξει*, or not in order of time. The latter statement Mr. Greswell himself rejects,² and with good reason, as directly disproved by all the internal evidence. It is difficult, then, to attach much weight to the other assertion, unless there were internal evidence to confirm its truth. The very idea that the first written gospel was left in a dialect known to a small minority of the church, and that chance translations were the only resource of all the rest, is highly

Papias proved in error on another point.

¹ There is no real exception in the case of Jerome. The gospel that he saw and copied at the Syrian Beræa, and translated into Greek and Latin, could not have been the original of our present gospel, though for a time he was inclined to think so.—Ed.

² "Harmony of Gospels," vol. i. pp. 5 and 154, etc. He holds that Mark translated Matthew's Aramaic, and that to this the words of Papias refer.—Ed.

Eusebius and Origen are not consistent.

unnatural, and hard to reconcile with the wisdom of the apostles. Of later writers, it is remarkable that both Eusebius and Origen, while they repeat the usual tradition of a Hebrew gospel, in their own criticisms plainly assume that St. Matthew himself wrote in the Greek language. And thus the earliest writer destroys his own authority by a statement, certainly untrue on a kindred subject, in the same context; while the writers, whose learning gave them most weight, seem to be divided in their own judgment, and no trace of the supposed Hebrew gospel can be found in any credible and direct witness of its existence in later times.

2. The circumstances of the church.

2. Next, are the presumptions, from the circumstances of the church, in favour of a Greek or Hebrew original? The remarks of Hug on this point seem really decisive. We find, from Acts xxii. 2 ("And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence"), that even in Jerusalem itself a promiscuous crowd would have understood a discourse in Greek, though they listened to their own Hebrew dialect with greater pleasure. We find that, as early as the appointment of the seven deacons, the number of Greek-speaking converts was so multiplied, as to be an occasion of strife and jealousy in the mother church. In Cæsarea they would, of course, be still more numerous. It is clear, also, that in Galilee of the Gentiles, as its name implies, Greek was more current and usual than in Judea, which was the main seat of the old national associations. Indeed the opinion is most probable, that our Lord himself often used the Greek language in his discourses to mixed audiences, at least in Galilee.¹ It is certain that Greek was the language of

¹ My father, in the course of a review of the question of the language of the New Testament, after summarizing the arguments of Diodati and Roberts, refers to this, his former statement, and adds:

"All later reflection has led me to go still further in this direction. The thesis I would now maintain is that there is a decided distinction in respect of the relative prevalence of Greek between Galilee and Samaria on the one side, and Judea on the other; that the exceptions (to the use of Greek) on which Hug insists apply only to Judea, while in Galilee of the Gentiles the view of Voss, Dobbin, and Roberts, and

Herod's court, and of several of the Galilean towns, and one of the twelve apostles has a purely Greek name. According to the Mishna,¹ quoted by Hug, "the Jews were not permitted to compose books in all languages, but it shall only be permitted them to write books in the Greek," and a bill of divorce might be written in Greek or Hebrew. The Professor sums his remarks as follows:

"If St. Matthew wrote Greek, the mass of the people understood him; but for that part of the people who perhaps only spoke the language of the country, he was compensated by those cities which the Greeks had taken from the Jews, by the Hellenistic communities in the holy city, and by the other Hellenists in the Christian school, to whom he could not make himself understood in any other way. If he wrote Hebrew he renounced the great, and perhaps the nobler, part of his readers. At the same time, if he had the adjacent environs in view, Antioch, Tyre, and Sidon, and other cities along the coast, he could not but give the preference to the Greek. If his whole thoughts were fixed on the latter times of the people, and he wished to write not merely for a few years, he would not write in the language of the Jews, whose state was approaching its dissolution."²

3. The analogies, from all the other books of the New Testament, are clearly in favour of a Greek original. For not only the gospels of St. Mark and St. John, written by Jews, but the epistles of St. Paul to the Hebrew Christians, of St. Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, and of St. James, the bishop of the church at Jerusalem, are all in the Greek language, and no trace of a Hebrew autograph is found in any one instance. The gospel of St. Matthew, if it were written in Hebrew, would be a solitary contrast to

3. The analogies from other books of the New Testament.

that of Diodati slightly modified, expresses the real truth; and that there, unlike Judea, Greek was commonly used, not only in public and set discourse, but even in private and familiar conversation."—*MS.*, 1878.

¹ "Mishna Tract. Megilloth," c. i. n. 8, quoted Hug, vol. ii. p. 46, Eng. Trans.

² Hug's *Introd.*, vol. ii. pp. 55-57.

these other writings, where the reason for choosing the Syriac dialect would seem equally strong. And so far as previous occupation is any guide, a Roman tax-gatherer would be less likely to adopt the Hebrew dialect, than a Pharisee of the strictest sect, like St. Paul, or a fisherman of Capernaum, like St. Peter, or a Jew of Nazareth and of David's lineage, like St. James, all of whom have preferred the Greek, even when writing to Jewish Christians.

4. And the internal evidence favours a Greek original.

4. The internal features of the gospel prove that it is not a mere version.¹ If a translation at all, considerable license must have been used by the unknown translator. The following passages contain indications of a Greek rather than Hebrew original.

a. The manner in which Hebrew terms are introduced.

i. 16. "The husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called the Christ" (ὁ χρίστος). In a translation we should expect to find *Messias*, the Hebrew form of the name. So also i. 17, 18.

i. 23. "They shall call his name Immanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us."

iv. 18. "Simon, called Peter, and Andrew his brother." In a translation, it would be natural to retain *Cephas*, the Syriac form of the surname.

v. 18. "One iota or one tittle shall not pass from the law," etc. The Greek letter being thus used in a proverbial phrase, makes it probable that the discourse was

¹ It seems to be generally recognized that our present gospel of St. Matthew bears in itself no trace of being a translation.

Dr. Westcott (so far as I understand him) supposes that St. Matthew taught both in Aramaic and Greek; that when he quitted Jerusalem, he left the substance of his teaching in written form in Aramaic, the first of written gospels; that long years afterwards, when the distinction of Greek-speaking and Hebrew-speaking Christians was growing more marked, some one (it is quite uncertain who he was) gave a Greek version of St. Matthew's teaching, having recourse not to the Aramaic gospel, but to the concurrent Greek oral teaching. This gospel we accept, because the church at that time accepted it, as being practically Matthew's own.

This removes the difficulty of our gospel showing no trace of a translator's hand; but it seems to me to leave a great many others, and to be certainly far less simple than the view propounded in the present work.—ED.

recorded, and perhaps even that it was preached, in the Greek language.

v. 22. "Whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca (Syr.), shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Fool (Gr. *μωρὸς*), shall be in danger of hell fire." It is difficult to understand how a mere translation would have given the passage in this form, with a climax formed by a Syriac and a Greek term of reproach.

v. 41. "And whosoever shall compel thee to go with him one mile (*μίλιον εἷς*), go with him two." The Latinism implies a living Greek dialect, with Latin terms infused, and does not give the idea of a second-hand version from a Syriac original.

xxi. 9, 15. "Hosanna to the son of David, hosanna in the highest." The retention of this Hebrew term alone, when Greek titles are so constant in the gospel, would be an arbitrary distinction in a mere translator, and is therefore another slight presumption for a Greek original.

The passage, xxiii. 8-10, is still more explicit. Our Lord there forbids his disciples to use the Hebrew title, Rabbi, and the equivalent Greek title, *καθηγητής*, and appends to both the same reason, "for one is your master" (*καθηγητὴς*). It seems a reasonable conclusion, that Rabbi was one of the Hebrew titles of honour, commonly retained even in the Hellenistic dialect; that our Lord's admonition was actually given in that dialect, and that the evangelist has recorded it in the Greek dialect, in which it was uttered. For it is not at all likely that *καθηγητής* was adopted into the Syriac language, or that a translator would invent a double precept, when our Lord had uttered, and his apostle recorded, one only.

xxvii. 8. "Wherefore that field is called, The field of blood, unto this day."

17. "Barabbas, or Jesus, which is called Christ."

33. "A place called Golgotha, which is called The place of a skull."

46. "Eli, Eli, lama Sabachthani, that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

All these passages have certainly the very tone which

we should expect in an original, rather than a translation.

b. Quotations from the Old Testament.

The quotations from the Old Testament are difficult to explain on the hypothesis of a mere translation. They have a general agreement with the Septuagint, but the variations are characteristic and important. Thus in chap. ii. the version is modified in three passages, so as to be more apposite or perspicuous. The prophecy, Isa. ix. 2, is also quoted with important changes, though still based on the Septuagint (cf. St. Matt. iv. 15). The passage, Isa. xlii. 1-3, is quoted apparently in a version entirely new, though in many places the reading of the Seventy is adopted without change (cf. St. Matt. xii. 18-21). Again, in Matt. xxvii. 9, 10, the prophecy of Zechariah is quoted very freely, and seems to vary, not only from the Greek translation, but from the present Hebrew text (cf. Zech. xi. 13). These varieties all tend to show, either that the gospel was originally written in Greek, or else the translator's office was too weighty and responsible, to make it credible that he should be left altogether uncertain and unknown. The former is by far the simpler view, and most consistent with the plain facts of ecclesiastical history, which give no evidence to fix the person of the supposed translator.

c. The titles of our Lord.

5. A further argument for the early date of the Greek gospel may be drawn from the titles of our Lord. For in this gospel alone he is invariably spoken of under his personal name, Jesus. In St. Mark, he receives the title of reverence twice only, in the last verses. "*So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven. . . . And they went forth and preached . . . the Lord working with them.*" In St. Luke it becomes of frequent occurrence, still more so in the Book of Acts, while this and similar titles are of constant use in St. Paul's epistles. Even when full allowance has been made for the difference between letters and histories, this gradual variation confirms the view, that St. Luke's gospel was written before the first of St. Paul's epistles; and still more confirms the usual order of the gospel, and the early date of the Greek gospel of St. Matthew.

6. In the Sermon on the Mount, we find the saying, "Thou shalt not come thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing" (κοδράντης) (St. Matt. v. 26). If this had been written in Hebrew, and translated afterwards into Greek, it is probable that the translator would have used *λεπτόν*, a pure Greek term, which we find in St. Luke xii. 59, in the very same expression. But St. Matthew, as a receiver of Roman custom, would be familiar with the quadrans, the least Roman coin, and naturally use it in a Greek history, or retain it unaltered, if our Lord himself had so used it.

d. The Latinisms.

The same remark applies to *φραγελλώσας*, xxvii. 26. In a Hebrew gospel the pure Hebrew term would of course be used, and a later translation would substitute the pure Greek, *μαστιγώσας*. But St. Matthew himself, being familiar with a Hellenistic dialect, charged with many Latinisms, would naturally use a term, nearly the same, if not the very same, in which Pilate gave the order for the punishment of Jesus.

Again, the word *ἐπιούσιος*, which is found only in the two gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke (St. Matt. vi. 11; St. Luke xi. 3), seems to indicate that the former was written in Greek, if not rather that the prayer itself was uttered in that language. The adoption of such a peculiar term, alike by St. Luke and an unknown translator, would be a surprising coincidence, while St. Luke might very naturally adopt it from the Greek gospel of St. Matthew, or both might possibly¹ retain the actual word which our Lord employed.

e. The Greek word *ἐπιούσιος*, etc.

Again, the description of the woman of Canaan would probably have been expounded by a translator into the more modern term, which St. Mark has used, a Syro-Phœnician. In its actual form, it seems a presumption for the early composition of the Greek gospel.

On the whole, all the internal evidence, whether of style, of quotation, or of relation to the two other gospels of St.

Tradition in itself is liable to error, and in the present case is contrary to probability.

¹ I think my father would in later years have written "*probably*."
—ED.

Mark and St. Luke, seems to prove that the present Greek copy of St. Matthew is really from the pen of the apostle, and not from some unknown hand. Nor is the alleged consent of early writers of much weight, to establish a Hebrew original, which has left no trace of its existence, and which no one seems ever to have seen. All of them, except Papias and Irenæus, are too late to avail as direct testimony. The statement of Papias, with regard to the second gospel, is the exact reverse of the truth, and hence his brief mention of a Hebrew gospel, which every one used to interpret as they could, is of no very serious weight. Irenæus, again, is proved by Scripture evidence to be doubly in error, when he places the second and third gospels after Paul's decease, and that of Matthew during his last imprisonment at Rome. And indeed the supposition that no gospel was written till thirty-six years after the Ascension, and then in Syriac, just at the beginning of the convulsions that scattered and destroyed the Jews, and when the converts who spoke Greek must have been tenfold more than those who knew Hebrew only, is very like an historical absurdity. We have an instance at the close of the fourth gospel, and in the lifetime of St. John, of one false tradition that had gone abroad among the disciples, and in which a nucleus of truth was rapidly encrusted with serious error (St. John xxi. 23). Now it was a certain truth, that St. Matthew wrote especially for Jewish Christians in Palestine; and those at a distance, who knew of the prevalence among them of a peculiar dialect, and overlooked the equal or greater prevalence of the Greek language, or confounded the provincial and Hebraistic Greek with the proper Syriac tongue, might easily infer that this first gospel was written in Hebrew. But the early reception of the actual gospel, as we now have it; the entire ignorance of those who first allude to a Hebrew gospel, when or by whom it was translated, and the contradictory guesses of later writers; the fact that St. Paul wrote to the Christians of Palestine, and St. James to the suffering Jews, not in Hebrew, but in Greek; the certainty, derived from St. Luke's narrative, that a turbulent and mixed crowd at Jerusalem

could understand an address to them in the Hellenistic dialect; and the prospective aim, with which this gospel, like the others, was doubtless written;—all conspire to establish its authenticity, as the work of St. Matthew, and of no other. It is certainly possible that he might previously have written one in Hebrew; but the negative evidence, from its total disappearance, and from the analogy of the other sacred writings, seems considerably to outweigh the vague and inconsistent statements of Papias and Irenæus, on which alone the fact of its existence must depend.

St. Matthew may have written a Hebrew gospel earlier, but it is little likely.

APPENDIX TO BOOK II.

As the discussion of the external evidence for a Hebrew original of St. Matthew's gospel is somewhat meagre in the last chapter of the present book, I have thought it well to add as an Appendix an unpublished MS. of my father's on the "Authenticity of the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew," written in the year 1878. He has also left a longer discussion on the wider question of the language spoken by our Lord and his apostles, the insertion of which would too greatly disturb the proportions of the present volume to make it to my mind expedient.

Throughout the discussion the term "Hebrew" is used in a loose sense for what, more strictly speaking, should be described as Aramaic, the native language of the Jews at the time of the Christian era.

ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GREEK GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.

INTRODUCTION.

THE first question which meets us when we inquire into the historical authority and truth of the Four Gospels, their external evidence, and their internal relations to each other, is that of the Authenticity of the First Gospel. Is it really, as is commonly supposed, and as its title implies, the work of St. Matthew the apostle? Or is it simply a translation into Greek by some unknown party¹ of a Hebrew gospel, written by that apostle,

The problem
stated.

¹ Of course it is *possible*, on the supposition of an Aramaic original, as some have maintained, that St. Matthew himself was the trans-

which has perished and disappeared long ago? Is the Greek gospel, or is it not, the authentic work of the apostle whose name it has borne on its front for eighteen hundred years?

The opinion of a Hebrew original said to be universal till the Reformation.

This statement must be qualified.

The negative opinion, that the first gospel is a translation only, of which the original has long perished, rests upon certain statements of Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, adopted by Chrysostom, Augustine, Isidore, Theophylact, and some others, so as to have been plainly a very current tradition from the second century onward. Dr. Tregelles, indeed, affirms that this opinion was universal for fourteen hundred years, till the Reformation, but the assertion is made on very insufficient grounds. The name of St. Matthew on the title-page of the Greek gospel, with no mention of its being a mere translation, and its entire resemblance to the other Greek gospels, which all admit to be original, would produce a conviction of its apostolic authorship in all those Christians who used it, except the small proportion who had their attention drawn to the assertions that it was only a translation, and who gave them implicit credence. It seems very likely that nine out of every ten Christians in all ages took the title as a sufficient proof of the real authorship, agreeing as it did so perfectly with all the internal evidence, and either did not know of the opposite doctrine, or did not care to examine further, or refused to accept an opinion so liable to various interpretations as that of Papias, and beset with so many causes of natural suspicion.

Division of opinion since.

Ever since the Reformation there has plainly been a great conflict of judgment on this question among learned men, and the controversy lasts to the present hour.¹ . . .

lator; but if so, it is very remarkable that no single writer of antiquity has made mention of a fact so interesting and important. In the absence of all evidence it does not seem likely.—ED.

¹ My father here gives a long list of authorities for the different opinions, which, as I have been unable to trace them out with any thoroughness, I have thought it better to consign to a foot-note.—ED.

“The view that St. Matthew wrote only in Hebrew, not in Greek, and that our present gospel is a translation by some unknown hand, has been held by Calixtus, Reland, Du Pin, Bellarmine, Baronius, Grotius, Casaubon, Simon, Tillemont, Calmet, Elsner, Voss, Michaelis, Storr, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Kuinoel, Mill, Cave, Hammond, Walton, Kidder, Marsh, Tolmine, A. Clarke, Campbell, Neander, Tholuck, Greswell, Norton, Davidson, Tischendorf, and Tregelles.

“The opposite view—that our Greek gospel is the authentic work

Dean Alford, in the first edition of his "Commentary of the New Testament," held to a Hebrew original in deference to what seemed to him "the irresistible weight of the testimony of antiquity." But in his third edition, December, 1855, after close study of the gospel, and comparison with the others, he says that his view of its Hebrew origin is much shaken. After some comments on St. Jerome's opinion (modified afterwards) that the gospel to the Hebrews was "the true original gospel of St. Matthew," he feels constrained to abandon his former view, and adopt that of a Greek original. In my "*Horæ Evangelicæ*," December, 1850, I had expressed a similar change of judgment. Starting from an adoption with Greswell of the frequent view of a Hebrew original, I came to a full conviction, from a comparison of the gospels and the internal evidence, that the Greek gospel is the authentic work of St. Matthew, and without an absolute rejection of the view that he had previously written one in Hebrew, inclined to disbelieve that such a work had ever proceeded from his hands.

Dean Alford's
change of
view.

Similar change
of view in
Author.

5. The pamphlet of Dr. Tregelles¹ (Kitto's "Journal of Sacred Literature," January, 1850, vol. v. pp. 151-185) is one of the most recent summaries of the argument against the authenticity of the Greek gospel. He even maintains that, unless we admit that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and that the present Greek gospel is only a translation by some other party, we have no

The views of
Dr. Tregelles.

of St. Matthew, and no other—is held by Erasmus Ecolampadius, Cajetan, Calvin, Paræus, Beza, Gerhardt, Heidegger, Calovius, Lightfoot, Clericus, Capellus, Beausobre, Lardner, Fabricius, Leusden, Wetstein, Paulus, Semler, Venema, Jortin, Hug, Fritzsche, Bleek and Moses Stuart, and Alford.

"The following incline to a third view—that St. Matthew wrote first in Hebrew and then in Greek, so that our Greek copy is still his authentic work: Schwartz, Bengel, Guereke, Schott, Whitby, Benson, Townson, Hales, Horne, Bloomfield, Thiersch, Kitto, Lee, Lange, and Olshausen.

"This opinion, again, has been condemned strongly as a mere makeshift, and wholly wanting in direct evidence, by advocates of the Hebrew on the one side, as Principal Campbell and Dr. Tregelles, and by Credner, De Witte, and Mr. Roberts on the other, who maintain the authenticity of the Greek gospel." (See also Tregelles, "Journal of Sacred Literature," vol. v. p. 168.—ED.)

¹ It was, I believe, published as a separate work by Bagster; but this I have not seen.—ED.

sufficient ground for believing that he wrote a gospel at all. For if we reject ancient testimony on one point we may do it with equal warrant on the other. This is surely a strange and novel maxim, that unless we believe all that a witness affirms we may reasonably disbelieve him in all. The exact reverse is certainly the very first requisite in a reasonable treatment of ancient evidence.

And of Mr.
Roberts.

The work of Mr. Roberts ("Discussions on the Gospels," 1862) is of much greater length, a volume of 500 pages. Its main conclusions are the same to which I had come in the "Horæ," and are briefly these. First, that Greek was the language usually employed by our Lord himself in his own discourses, and by the apostles in their early preaching of the gospel. Second, that on this ground it was used by all the other writers of the New Testament—St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John, St. Paul, St. Peter, St. James, St. Jude. Third, that for the very same reason it was used by St. Matthew, and that he also recorded the discourses of Christ in the very language in which they were spoken. Fourth, that the entire disappearance of the Hebrew gospel, had it really existed, cannot be reasonably explained. Fifth, that the successive statements of Papias and others are only a tradition at second or third hand, and based on a total misapprehension with regard to the degree of prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine in the time of our Lord and his apostles.

There are, however, secondary points of some importance on which I disagree, and I think further light may be thrown upon the subject by a renewed examination.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE WEIGHT DUE TO EARLY TRADITION.

THE evidence for a Hebrew original consists in certain statements of Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, adopted in part or wholly by Chrysostom, Augustine, Isidore, and Theophylact, and not formally contradicted by any ancient writer. It will be the clearest plan, with Alford, to begin by quoting them at length.

*Resumé of the
ancient
evidence.*

First. Papias, A.D. 120 (quoted in Eusebius, "Hist. Ecc.," iii. 36):

Papias,
A.D. 120.

"Matthew, then, composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and each one translated them as he was able."¹

Secondly. Irenæus, A.D. 178 ("Adv. Hær.," iii. 1, p. 174). Perhaps, but not certainly, repeated from Papias, whom he consults largely.

Irenæus,
circ. 178 A.D.

"Matthew, indeed, among the Hebrews, in their own dialect, put forth also a writing of the gospel while Peter and Paul were evangelizing in Rome and founding the church."

Thirdly. In the "Hist Ecc.," v. 10, Eusebius gives this statement:

Pantænus,
circ. 180 A.D.

"Pantænus is reported to have gone to the Indians, where there is a report that he found, having preceded his arrival, the gospel of St. Matthew among some who had then believed in Christ; to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, had preached, and left them the gospel of Matthew in Hebrew letters, and that this had also been preserved to that time."

And Jerome gives the same account: "He (Pantænus) found that in India Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, had preached the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ according to the gospel of Matthew, which, written in Hebrew letters, he brought

¹ The statement *may* have been derived from John the Presbyter. If so, the witness is carried one generation higher.—Ed.

with him when he returned to Alexandria" ("De Viris Illustr.," 36, vol. ii. p. 876).

Origen,
185-255 A.D.

Fourthly. Origen on Matthew, preserved in Eusebius ("Hist. Ecc.," vi. 25), describes himself as "having learned by tradition (ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν) concerning the four gospels, which alone are uncontradicted in the Church of God under heaven, that the first was written by Matthew, once a publican, but afterwards an apostle of Christ, who put it forth for those who had believed from Judaism, composed in Hebrew letters (γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον)."

Eusebius,
circ. 320 A.D.

Fifthly. Eusebius writes ("Hist. Ecc.," iii. 24):

"Matthew, indeed, having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to others also, having committed to them the gospel according to him in writing in their own tongue supplied by the writing what was wanting of his presence to these from whom he was sent away."

And again, "Ad Marin.," Quæst. ii. vol. iv. p. 941:

"ὧσε τοῦ σαββάτου has been written by him who interpreted the gospel, for the evangelist delivered it in the Hebrew tongue."

Epiphanius,
320-403 A.D.

Sixthly. Epiphanius writes of the Ebionites and Nazarenes ("Hær.," xxix. 9, vol. i. p. 124):

"They have the gospel of St. Matthew very complete in Hebrew, for this is plainly preserved among them, as it was from the beginning written in Hebrew letters."

And again of the Nazarenes: "And they also receive the gospel according to Matthew, but call it the gospel of the Hebrews, as it is truly styled, because Matthew alone in Hebrew (Ἑβραῖσιν καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν) in the New Testament made an exposition and preaching of the gospel" (xxx. 3, p. 127).

Jerome,
378-420 A.D.

Seventhly. Jerome, A.D. 378-420, has several statements on this subject.

"Præf. in Matt." (vol. vii. pp. 3, 4): "Matthew in Judea published a gospel in the Hebrew tongue, especially for their sake who had believed in Jesus from among the Jews."

"De Viris Illustribus," c. 3 (vol. ii. p. 833): "Matthew, who is also Levi, from a publican an apostle, was the first to compose a gospel of Christ in Judea for the sake of those who had believed from the circumcision, in Hebrew words and letters, and who it was that afterwards translated these into Greek is not sufficiently certain. Moreover the Hebrew itself is preserved up to the present day in the library at Cæsarea which Pamphilus

the Martyr very diligently collected. I had leave also given me to copy it by the Nazarenes in Beræa a city of Syria who use this work. In which it is to be observed that wherever the evangelist, either in his own person or the person of the Lord the Saviour, uses testimonies of the Old Testament, he does not follow the authority of the lxx., but of the Hebrew."

"Præf. ad Damasum" (vol. x. 527): "I speak now of the New Testament, which undoubtedly is Greek, except the Apostle Matthew, who composed the gospel in Hebrew speech." So Ep. xx., "Damaso. de Osanna," 5 (vol. i. p. 68): "Matthew, who wrote the gospel in the Hebrew language, and so put Osanna Berama, that is, Hosanna in the Highest."

Ep. cxx., "Hedibræ," Quæst. viii. 1, p. 831: "But in the gospel, which is written in Hebrew letters, we read not that the veil of the temple was rent, but that a pinnacle of the temple of wonderful size fell."

Again, "Comm. in Hos.," xi. (vol. vi. p. 123), on the words "Out of Egypt have I called my son": "Julian the Emperor, in the seventh volume which he vomited against us, defames this passage, and says that the evangelist Matthew transferred to Christ what is written of Israel, that he might trifle with their simplicity who had believed from among the Gentiles. To whom we will reply briefly that Matthew wrote the gospel in Hebrew letters, which none could read but those who were of the Hebrews. Therefore he did not do it that he might trifle with the Gentiles." He also refers to the tradition of Pantænus ("De Vir. Illustr.," 36, vol. ii. p. 836).

The opinion was adopted by Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustine, and others, but they add nothing to our information.

These passages constitute the whole evidence for a Hebrew gospel of St. Matthew, and for denying the authorship of the extant Greek gospel. Dr. Tregelles affirms that their testimony must be received, unless we would put mere opinion above attested facts; that all early Christians believed that the Greek gospel they possessed was only a translation, and that no one had a word to say in opposition to this opinion; that this view was universal for fourteen hundred years, and that all the witnesses who depose that Matthew wrote a gospel at all affirm that he wrote it in Hebrew. So that its rejection, in his view, is a serious blow at the whole historical evidence of the gospel history.

On this evidence Dr. Tregelles founds a claim to catholic consent,

Reasons for caution in accepting the tradition.

The testimony of the inscription in all known copies of St. Matthew has weight upon the other side.

The false tradition of St. John's immortality.

We have here, I think, an extreme instance of the narrow and scanty basis on which the claim of an opinion to catholic consent and universal acceptance may be reared. Six authors, Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, spread over three centuries, A.D. 120-420, in passages which amount to two or three pages only, are held to prove the universal opinion of all Christians for those years. None of these, except Jerome, professes to have seen a copy of this Hebrew gospel, and what he seems to have mistaken for it was so far from being the same, that he was at the pains to translate the whole into Greek. This is surely a decisive proof that it could not be the Hebrew counterpart of the Greek gospel we now have. Thus the assertion by these six writers of the past existence of a Hebrew gospel of St. Matthew, which not one of them had seen, is held to outweigh and reverse the testimony from the inscription in every known copy of the Greek gospel that Matthew was its author, and this not in the minds of a few only who might have read these passages, but of all the millions of Christians who read and used those copies of the Greek St. Matthew for fourteen hundred years.

The Fourth Gospel ends with a striking instance of the slippery and deceptive nature of floating oral tradition. A belief was current among the first disciples for sixty years, from the date of Christ's resurrection to the gospel itself, that our Lord had announced that John would not die, but survive to his own return. This opinion spread from no mean or inferior source, but from six of the apostles themselves who were present with St. John on that occasion. It was their honest but mistaken inference from words of Christ spoken in their hearing after his resurrection. But St. John, not long before his death, at the close of his gospel, corrects this false tradition, which, unless removed, would in a few years have left the Lord under the seeming reproach of having given a false and misleading prophecy. He draws a clear and sharp contrast between the real saying of Christ and the inexact report of it by his fellow apostles, which had spread from them to the main body of the faithful, "Then went the saying abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die." Had the mistake continued a little longer without correction, it would have hung like a millstone around the neck of the gospel in every later age.¹

¹ That the saying went abroad amongst the brethren during the life-

The First Gospel at its close has another instance of an early tradition strongly attested in appearance by contemporary witnesses, and which long furnished the Jews with a pretext for their rejection of the gospel. The soldiers who had been set as a watch over the tomb reported, "His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept." Here is a tradition dating from the time of the event, attested by parties on the spot, and strengthened by the fact that it seemed to be flatly against their own credit, and charged them with entire failure in their own duty as watchers. "And this saying," says St. Matthew, "is commonly reported among the Jews till this day."

The false tradition current through the soldiers at the tomb.

The tradition which we are now examining in Papias and his successors is inferior to both of these in one very important particular. It does not date from the time of the supposed event to which it refers, but at least fifty years later. But if a traditional report by apostles themselves of a saying of Christ, which they were present and heard, involved a great error which would have wrought great mischief unless it had been corrected by the written and inspired report of their fellow apostle, how much less can it be our duty to give implicit faith to Papias and others who followed him as to a Hebrew gospel, which none of them had seen, and of which the earliest mention is at least half a century later than the latest date to which its origin can be referred.

The tradition in one respect rests on a less firm basis, for it was not contemporary.

One feature seems common to all three cases, and is the usual character of unwritten oral traditions. A nucleus of truth is closely mingled with partial error, and it requires skill and patient thought to affect their separation. There was a real saying of Christ on the subject of St. John's later course which his fellow apostles had heard, and it did convey an intimation that his life would probably be prolonged after their death. Only it was not spoken to gratify, but to check and reprove St. Peter's natural but unwise curiosity. It is true, again, that the keepers had not kept awake throughout their watch. They were thrown into a stupor by the vision of the angel, and became as

One common feature in all three. A nucleus of truth and partial error.

time of those six Apostles, or some of them, and with their tacit acquiescence, would seem to be plain from the narrative; but that it actually was put abroad by them in such a form is not at all so clear. They may, or they may not, have shared the belief themselves; but it would take firm hold on the great body of the Christians only as the eleven one by one died, or were slain, and John alone remained.—ED.

dead men, and when they awoke from their trance the body was gone. So far their report was true, but that they were competent witnesses of what occurred during their sleep was plainly impossible. But what they knew, pieced out with what they only guessed, and what, rejecting the thought of a Divine miracle, was the most natural inference, formed by the union a most mischievous and deadly falsehood.

The partial error of Papias due to a very natural inference from actual fact.

The tradition in Papias in like manner consists of four parts—that St. Matthew was the writer of the first gospel, that he wrote it with special reference to the Jewish Christians of Palestine, that he wrote it in Hebrew, not in Greek, and that the translation of it into Greek was for some time left to chance, everyone doing it as he needed, and as best he could.

But an inference contradicted by wider experience.

The first of these four statements is confirmed not only by the universal consent of later writers, but by the inscription at the opening of every known copy of the first gospel. The second also, rightly understood, is confirmed by the internal features of the gospel. But the third and fourth, instead of being confirmed by this vast body of distinct evidence from the inscription and contents of the Greek gospel, are strongly contradicted by them. There is thus a very strong reason why the acceptance of one part of the statement does by no means involve logically the giving of equal credit to the other.

And entailing eleven consequences hard to be believed.

The statement of Papias, if wholly believed, brings with it these consequences, very hard to believe:

1st. That the first written record of our Saviour's life was in a different language from every other inspired writing of the New Testament.

2nd. That it perished long ago.

3rd. That there is no distinct evidence that any known person or Christian author ever saw it.

4th. That if it existed at all, it was soon corrupted into a document so different from its original shape and contents as to require retranslation like a wholly distinct work.

5th. That the inscription which begins the Greek Testament in every known copy of the Greek gospels is wholly misleading and deceptive, for it ascribes to St. Matthew the *Greek* gospel, and not some unknown and practically invisible work in Hebrew.

6th. That if our Lord spoke and taught for the *most* part in Aramæan only, one report only of his very words was made by any of the apostles, and that one report was neglected, and

disappeared, or was greatly garbled and corrupted soon after it was made.

7th. That, on the other hand, if our Lord spoke and taught mainly in Greek, the first record was not of his very words themselves, but a translation of them into Aramæan, which took precedence of later reports of the words themselves, and has since perished.

8th. That the true author of the first gospel (in its present form), the leading book of the New Testament, is wholly unknown.

9th. That the relations of verbal correspondence between St. Matthew and the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, which were undoubtedly written and published in Greek, are made quite inexplicable.

10th. That the whole church received and circulated as the writing of an apostle, and gave the first place in the Canon of the New Testament, to a mere version by some unknown party, which we have no means at all of comparing with the original on which it depends.

Finally, we have to believe a work to be a mere translation which has no marks of being a version, but all the features of an original, and to believe in the existence of an original which disappeared wholly, or else was corrupted into something quite different from itself almost as soon as it was written.

These reasons have such force as to have led a majority of critics, since the revival of learning, to question strongly, or to reject altogether, the early tradition of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew. But Dr. Tregelles says that this is to put mere opinion above attested facts; that we have no evidence that St. Matthew wrote a gospel at all except that we have for his writing it in Hebrew; that the ancients who state this were accustomed to Greek, and would have no prepossession, except the truth alone, for affirming a Hebrew original. Further, he asks very strangely, "if he did not write in Hebrew, what claim has any one other language more than another to be considered the original? The same witnesses who affirm that St. Matthew wrote at all, and on whose authority we believe it, say that he wrote in Hebrew, and if we deny this we weaken and invalidate the evidence that he wrote a gospel at all."

Hence, perhaps, the majority of modern critics strongly question or wholly reject the view of a Hebrew original.

This questioning held by Tregelles to threaten the whole authority of the ancient gospel.

The argument from supposed prepossession would evidently tell just as much to persuade us, like the Jews, to credit the

This is not so, for it is a first principle to

learn to distinguish parts in the discussion of ancient evidence.

statement of the soldiers, since it was much to their discredit to have fallen asleep during their watch.

For the rest, it is a first essential for the right treatment of questions of evidence to distinguish different parts of the same testimony, to observe which have further confirmation, and which rest on a naked and unsupported assertion only. In fact, to receive the statements of early writers where they agree with and are confirmed by other evidence, but to reject them where they are vague, inconsistent, and rest on mere hearsay, and come into collision with the plain and clear lessons of Christian faith and sound reason.

CHAPTER II.

THE APOCRYPHAL HEBREW GOSPEL.

* * * *

HERE my father's MS. breaks off abruptly, and only rough notes remain to show how he would have carried on the argument. These I will briefly summarize, and for further information refer the reader to the tenth lecture of Professor Salmon's "Introduction," where a most interesting account of this Apocryphal gospel may be found, and of the motives which may have left St. Jerome to attach undue importance to it on a first acquaintance.

My father's theory would seem to be that this whole edifice of ancient tradition about a Hebrew original of St. Matthew's gospel is based upon a very natural misconception upon the part of Papias himself.¹ Papias, in Phrygia, lived far away from Palestine; he lived at a period at least half a century after the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews. The whole state of life in Palestine was altered by that great catastrophe; the old conditions were completely changed. Papias was no erudite historian, but, on the contrary, a man of somewhat narrow mind, apt to be credulous. He had got hold of a true

Papias, removed in time and place and epoch from the Palestine of Matthew's days, made a mistake about its language.

¹ Some remarks of Professor Salmon on this point are well worthy of attention, and show that in ascribing ignorance in this matter to Papias we treat him with no disrespect.

"If we had not better evidence, I doubt if we could attribute much value to the opinion of a bishop of Phrygia as to the extent to which Palestine had been bilingual fifty years before; for this is a point on which distance of place is a great bar to accurate knowledge. I could ask questions as to the language or dialect spoken in different parts of the Continent that I dare say most of you would beg to be excused from answering. I doubt whether many educated Frenchmen would have confidence in saying whether a Welsh Member of Parliament would address his constituents in Welsh, or an Irish one in Irish" ("Introd. to N. T.," p. 187).—ED.

fact that St. Matthew wrote especially for Jews. He leapt to the rash inference (for perhaps the words *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν*, with which he begins his statement, imply that it was nothing but an inference) that Matthew must have written in the Hebrew character and language. He overlooked the fact—which may be supported by a great mass of evidence from the New Testament itself as well as other sources—that Greek was the ordinary language of Galilee and of Samaria, and would be generally understood in Judea and Jerusalem, though there the Aramaic dialect, in private life at least, would be a formidable rival.

If any evangelist had written in Hebrew, we should expect it in the fourth, and not the first—the gospel of Judea, not of Galilee.

Hence when a truth, which results from an inductive study of all the Scripture evidence, replaces a falsehood taken up in direct opposition to that evidence, the reason which Papias offers as a proof that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew will prove the exact reverse—that he wrote in Greek. For the apostle to whom this Hebrew gospel is ascribed is one who does not include the Judean ministry of Christ, or the visits to Jerusalem, but one whose narrative has a purely Galilean character from first to last. Now Hebrew or Aramaic, we are expressly taught, was the distinctive dialect (*ἰδία διαλέκτος*) of Jerusalem and its environs, in express contrast to Galilee and the Galilean disciples whom the apostle was then addressing (Acts i. 19) in Hellenistic Greek. If from its special scope and theatre one gospel, and one only, were to be in Hebrew, it would surely have been the fourth and not the first, for the fourth alone is distinctively a record of the Judean and not the Galilean ministry of Christ.¹ Thus the very ground on which Papias and his successors have rested their tradition of a Hebrew gospel of St. Matthew, which no one can be proved even to have seen, and which has certainly been extinct for fifteen hundred years, if it ever existed, proves the reverse—that St. Matthew wrote a Greek gospel and a Greek gospel only.

The notion of a double Matthew a fresh source of confusion in a problem already difficult.

The question of the date, authenticity, and order of the four gospels, which we now possess, and which the Church has always held and honoured with the first place in the New Testament Canon, is a fourfold problem which has exercised the thoughts and researches of scholars and divines for eighteen centuries. The simplicity of the four gospels themselves is rivalled by the mysteriousness and difficulty of the critical problem of their

¹ On the other hand, of course, the late date of the Fourth Gospel, after the sweeping away of the old Jewish polity, would almost necessitate its composition in Greek.—ED.

mutual relation to each other. This problem, difficult in itself, is rendered insoluble by the traditional view which requires us to find a place and reasonable occasion for the birth and successive origin, not of four gospels, but of five, the Hebrew and Apocryphal Matthew, the Greek and genuine Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

This, I think, is a correct summary of the view my father held as to the first part of the statement of Papias, *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο*. He had also an explanation of the later words, *ἡρμήνευσε δὲ αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος*. "These words," he says, "have greatly perplexed the receivers of his traditions"; and then, after quoting from Dr. Davidson and Mr. Roberts to show the difficulties that are felt in them, he continues: "When the first and cardinal mistake of Papias has been corrected, I think they admit of a clear and simple explanation." If the Galilean discourses of Christ themselves were Greek and not Aramaic, as Scripture proves, the true inference, even if Matthew wrote specially for the use of Hebrew Christians, is that he wrote or compiled the discourses in Greek, not in Aramaic. However prevalent Greek was, and intelligible by many Jews not Galileans, there would certainly be some, perhaps many, Judean Christians to whom Aramaic (the *ἰδία διάλεκτος* of Jerusalem and its environs, Acts i. 19) was more intelligible, or at least more acceptable, than Greek. When only one record of the discourses and works of Christ was as yet given by apostolic authority, and that in the Greek language as we now possess it, and the church has always used it, these Hebrew-speaking believers would naturally seek to make use of it.

The public reader or teacher in each separate congregation would utilize parts of it by oral, or in some cases even written translations into Aramaic. The primary fault of Papias in inferring a Hebrew St. Matthew from a premiss which really confirms a Greek gospel only, has led to an inversion of the real sense of the supplementary and dependent statement that follows. Instead of one Aramaic original which has wholly perished, and manifold imperfect and variable Greek translations from it which have equally perished and left no single trace, we have one and one only Greek St. Matthew, the true original, occupying the first place in the Canon of the New Testament for eighteen hundred years; and we have traces of several imperfect

The alleged diverse interpretations of the Aramaic gospel may be resolved into diverse, and, for the most part, Judaizing renderings of Matthew's Greek.

and variable Aramaic translations based on this, and derived from it by different congregations or parties of Hebrew Christians of the first ages. Such are (if we may rightly regard them as in every case distinct and separate documents):

1. The gospel of the Nazarenes.
2. That in the Cæsarean library, translated by Jerome.
3. The gospel according to the apostles.
4. The Aramaic gospel found by Pantænus in India, and said to have been left by St. Bartholomew.

As these Aramaic writings were adapted to the use and tastes of different knots of Hebrew-speaking and Judaizing Christians, as they were in no safe custody, and were made by no competent authority, they might be variously mutilated and interpolated, and would agree only in an imperfect general resemblance to that original, the Greek of St. Matthew, from which they were all either immediately or more remotely derived.

On this view
all becomes
consistent, and
easy to be
understood.

Thus the correction of the first and main blunder of Papias, that of inferring a Hebrew St. Matthew from a premiss which really confirms the fact that St. Matthew wrote in Greek the first inspired record of discourses, themselves uttered in Greek, restores the plain historical meaning, in harmony with known facts, to words which otherwise are incapable of any reasonable explication.

BOOK III.

ON THE IDEALITY OF THE GOSPELS, OR THE CHARACTERISTIC DESIGN OF EACH OF THE FOUR NARRATIVES.

Καὶ τὸ ζῶον τὸ πρῶτον ὅμοιον λέοντι, καὶ τὸ δεύτερον ζῶον ὅμοιον μόσχῳ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ζῶον ἔχων τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον ὅμοιον ἀετῶ̃ πετομένῳ, καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ἓν καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν, ἔχων ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ, κυκλόθεν καὶ ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν. Καὶ ἀνάπαντι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες "Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος.—*Apocalypse* iv. 7, 8.

"Circa thema generale
Habet quisque speciale
Stili privilegium¹
Quod præsignat in prophetâ
Formâ pictus sub discretâ
Vultus animalium."

Adam of St. Victor.

¹ This "speciale stili privilegium" of each evangelist is very tersely and effectively sketched in a note by Bishop Ellicott ("Hist. Lect. on the Life of our Lord," p. 33).—ED.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL.

The gospels show spiritual distinctness and mutual harmony as messages of truth from God.

THE Four Gospels, viewed simply as human histories, have been shown to bear special relations to each other, to the position of their authors, and the successive stages of the early church, besides their common purpose, as records of the life of Jesus. In their higher aspect, as inspired messages from God, the same double character of unity and diversity will probably be found to exist. Their common object, to reveal the person and work of the Son of God, will not exclude a peculiar adaptation, in each gospel, to unfold some special aspect of the Christian revelation. The perfection of Divine wisdom in their composition will be most apparent, if their historical propriety and truth, with reference to the circumstances of each writer, is joined with a spiritual distinctness and mutual harmony in their higher character as messages of eternal truth from the God of heaven.

Associated from early antiquity with the four cherubic symbols.

This view, which assigns a special purpose and character to each gospel, has prevailed in the church from the earliest days. From the time of Irenæus, Augustine, and Jerome, the evangelists have been popularly associated with the four cherubic symbols; and while the application of the three first has varied, St. John has been constantly represented by the emblem of the eagle.¹ The most usual view

¹ This is an oversight. Irenæus assigns the lion to St. John, the eagle to St. Mark. The early writers are unanimous only in giving the calf (the animal of sacrifice) to St. Luke. But in the Scripture symbolism, although the other animals change their order, the eagle is always last, which seems to justify in this respect the verdict of the

has been that of Jerome, who refers the man to St. Matthew, the lion to St. Mark, and the calf or ox to St. Luke. And though it is very unlikely that the four evangelists are personally denoted by those Apocalyptic emblems, yet since they clearly exhibit four varieties of spiritual intelligence in the heavenly places, it is reasonable to believe that the gospels may be designed to reveal the character of our Lord in four distinct forms of spiritual excellence and grace.

Let us dwell first on these emblems themselves. They appear, from the context (Rev. v. 6), to represent redeemed humanity in its noblest and highest attainments. The living creatures take precedence even of the crowned elders in their ceaseless worship. They seem to denote four distinct classes, each federally united, among those blessed saints, who occupy the foremost places in the kingdom of glory. There is also a general consent, among the most cautious interpreters, as to the spiritual features which each emblem is meant to portray. The face of a lion, according to Vitranga, denotes "that lofty affection of mind by which the ministers of Christ, like heroes, boldly resist the world and the devil;" according to Scott, it is "the known emblem of courage and magnanimity." The calf, or young ox, implies that "they are constant, assiduous, upright, laborious in fulfilling their office, and prepared to sustain great labours;" or again, "strength, hardiness, and patient endurance of labour." The face of a man is expounded, by one, to denote "humanity, clemency, moderation, and prudence;" and, by the other, "prudence, benevolence, and compassion." Lastly, the eagle, as nearly all agree, denotes "penetration, soaring beyond earthly things, the contemplation of heavenly objects, and clearness in discerning the deepest mysteries of Divine truth."

Again, the lion is joined in the same context with a remarkable title of our Lord, "the lion of the tribe of Judah," and thus clearly imports that he is a Conqueror and a King. The law of Moses, respecting the ox that treads out the

Western Church. For references, see Wordsworth, "Introduction to Gospels," p. xli; Professor Salmon, "Introd.," pp. 37, 38.—ED.

corn, is declared, again, by St. Paul to be an express type of the preachers of the gospel, the spiritual labourers in the vineyard of the Lord; while the eagle instinctively suggests the idea of a keen and penetrating vision, which can gaze on the brightness of the meridian sun, or discover objects at an immense distance from its lofty mountain home.

When the four living creatures are viewed in their order around the throne, they will offer a double contrast. If the eagle denotes celestial contemplation, the calf or young ox, which is bound most closely to the soil, will fully represent the opposite pole of spiritual excellence, in external activity, practical labour, and the fulfilment of duty in all the various details of outward life. One will denote that lofty thought which expatiates amidst the prophecies of the distant future, or the higher mysteries of the faith; and the other, the laborious diligence which breaks the clods with the plough in the seed-time, or treads out patiently the corn of the ripened harvest.

Again, the lion and the man form a second spiritual contrast. The beast of prey, sudden and terrible in its spring, may fitly represent the Divine righteousness in the punishment of evil; while the face of man expresses sympathy, compassion, and grace. One looks to the east, or sun-rise, and implies a retrospect of the past; the other, looking to the west, anticipation of the future. And hence we obtain these four cardinal ideas for the true meaning of the sacred emblems; kingly righteousness, with hatred of evil, and judicial equity and retribution; laborious diligence, and external activity, in the fulfilment of immediate duties, each in its season; human sympathy and compassion, with hopeful anticipation of good things to come; and, lastly, the contemplation of heavenly and eternal truth.¹

¹ In Dr. Westcott's "Introduction to the Gospels": These diverse aspects of the Common Truth are shown in a striking way to have been noticed but unduly emphasized to the exclusion of the complementary views by corresponding sects of heretics. (Westcott, "Intro.," p. 239 and fg.)

It has been strikingly said St. Matthew is the gospel of the past, St. Mark of the present, St. Luke of the future, St. John of the eternal. —ED.

When we compare these leading ideas with the four gospels, the correspondence in the fourth and last is very manifest. A tone of lofty contemplation and heavenly mystery, like the keen vision of the eagle, is conspicuous there from its opening to its close. The gospel of St. Matthew is also marked by a tone of kingly authority, and abounds in warnings of God's retributive justice. St. Mark unfolds the minute details of our Lord's ministerial labours, and exhibits, more plainly than the rest, his unwearied diligence in works of love. And certainly the gospel of St. Luke abounds in the richest exhibitions of the compassion of Jesus; while the words at its close, and the history of the church which follows, carry our thoughts onward, by a continual progress and joyful anticipation, to the full and final triumph of redeeming love.¹

The gospel of St. Matthew, if these views are just, reveals our Lord as the true Lawgiver and Righteous King, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who will execute sudden judgment on his enemies. Let us inquire how far its peculiarities are explained by this view of its peculiar design.

I. The gospel opens with the words, "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." These form the key-note of the whole message which it contains. Two names are singled out from the whole line of our Lord's ancestry, because they recall two main eras of prophecy, in which he was announced as the future King: "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen. xxii. 17, 18). Messiah is here predicted as a victorious king, who should subdue all his enemies, and bless the whole earth with his righteous dominion. The other title refers to the promise: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the

The gospel of St. Matthew presents our Lord as the true Lawgiver and Righteous King, the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

¹ It may be objected by sticklers for antiquity that my father's appointment of the cherubic symbols fails to find countenance among the Fathers of the Church. But surely we may appeal from Jerome, Augustine, or even Irenæus, to John the Divine himself; and if it be lawful to take the cherubim as symbols at all, it must be most natural to take them in this their biblical order.—Ed.

uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession" (Ps. ii. 8); or "The Lord hath sworn a faithful oath to David, he will not shrink from it: of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne" (Ps. cxxxii. 11). Our Lord is exhibited from the first as the heir of all these ancient promises; the Branch of righteousness, who should grow up to David, and who was to "reign and prosper and execute judgment and justice in the earth" (Jer. xxiii. 5).

This is apparent in the genealogy.

This prominence of the kingly character marks the following genealogy. Our Lord's descent is traced through the royal line of Judah; and the only title of honour in the whole series is that of David the king. The other break is equally significant, since the royal line closed at the captivity of Babylon.

The Prophecies.

II. The frequent quotation of the prophecies, as fulfilled in our Lord, is a main feature of St. Matthew's gospel. Its effect is to link the gospel of Christ with the whole course of sacred history, and to impress upon it a thoroughly retrospective character, while it is further exhibited as the proof of God's veracity, and the perfect consummation of all legal righteousness. The very first of these quotations has a direct reference to the kingly office of Jesus. It was given to king Ahaz in a time of political alarm, to be a pledge of national deliverance, and closes with a glorious description of Immanuel, on whose shoulder the government would be laid, whose name should be called THE PRINCE OF PEACE (St. Matt. i. 23; Is. vii. 14).

The Narrative of the Epiphany.

III. The same aspect of our Lord's character is conspicuous in the narrative of the Epiphany. The vision of the star leads the thoughts at once to Balaam's prophecy, where he announces a sceptre to arise out of Israel, that should subdue all his enemies (Numb. xxiv. 17). It is as King of the Jews that the wise men seek his birth-place, and that he excites, in his very infancy, the alarm and malice of Herod; and the scribes direct the cruel monarch to the prophecy of "a Governor, that shall rule his people Israel" (Micah v. 2). As a king, our Lord receives the presents of the wise men, and is shielded by a special providence from the malice of the usurper, Herod. A crown

of royal dignity, from the very first, is here made to encircle the brows of the infant Jesus.

IV. Again, the messages in this gospel are those addressed to Joseph alone, and not to Mary. For Joseph was the legal guardian, and it was through a legal adoption by Joseph, that Jesus was not only a descendant from David, but a direct legal successor to the royal line of the kings of Judah. The aged Jew, who died before the church was founded, was a fit representative of the integrity and righteousness of the elder dispensation ; just as the virgin, who survived the day of Pentecost, and was numbered among the first disciples, may represent the humility and grace of the new dispensation. The gospel, in this respect, further manifests its double character in looking backward on the past, and crowning the law and the prophets by the revelation of the Righteous King.

The promise assigned to Joseph.

The removal to Nazareth, as here described, has the same reference. Bethlehem is assumed to be the natural and proper home of the king of Israel. It is the temporary occupation of his throne by a cool usurper, which made a Divine admonition needful, that he should be brought up in a remoter province of Immanuel's own land, in Galilee of the Gentiles ; while the change subserves the indirect fulfilment of various prophecies.

V. The ministry of the Baptist, which follows, has the same character strongly impressed upon it. He appears as the herald, announcing the advent of the great King. He is introduced abruptly, with the words on his lips : " Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The prominent feature in his message, as reported by this evangelist, is the solemn warning to the rebellious Pharisees and Sadducees, and the description of Messiah as a righteous Judge, who will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. Even in the account of our Lord's baptism, the two features, of royal dignity and perfect righteousness, are specially developed in the humble address of the Baptist, and in the answer of Jesus, like a king to a subject : " Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness " (St. Matt. iii. 15).

The picture of the Baptist's ministry.

The view of
the Tempta-
tion and open-
ing ministry.

VI. The narrative of the Temptation has in this gospel the same peculiar features. It is not, as in St. Mark, a forcible constraint of the Spirit, to leave for a time the scene of his active labours; nor a secret and quiet impulse, as in St. Luke, proceeding from the fulness of spiritual life, which delighted to resist and oppose the will of the devil. It is a candidate for kingly exaltation, whom the Spirit *leads* into the wilderness, that he may there undergo the severest tests of his moral fitness for his destined honour. The order of the temptations varies from St. Luke, and the climax is the offer of all the kingdoms of the world, on the condition of one act of forbidden worship; while the conflict is closed by the willing homage of ministering angels to the true King and Lord of all.

The opening of our Lord's own ministry is equally characteristic of his kingly office. It begins with a reference to the prophecy of Emmanuel's dominion, quoted before; and is there described as a light breaking out in the darkness, and a reversal of all the former captivities and woes of Israel (Is. ix. 1, 2). Its first voice, like that of the Baptist, is an abrupt proclamation of the kingdom of heaven. Even in the brief summary of the first circuit through Galilee, the same feature is apparent; and the glad tidings of the kingdom are placed in the foreground, confirmed by our Lord's various works of power and love.

The Sermon
on the Mount.

VII. The Sermon on the Mount is one of the most distinctive features of the first gospel. The evangelist seems to hasten to it, across the many marvels which attended the opening of our Lord's ministry; as if he felt it to be one main object of his work, to record this simple and sublime outline of Christian morality. It breathes, in every part, the clear accents of a Lawgiver and a King. Its opening verses describe the character of those whom the king will enroll among his true subjects, and who shall thus inherit "the kingdom of heaven." From v. 17, to vii. 12, all is occupied with one great theme, well defined by the sublime introduction, which forms its preface—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto

you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." The relation of our Lord to the messages of the law and the prophets, as their true completion, and his authority as the Lawgiver, greater than Moses, are the key-notes which run through the whole discourse. Its close reveals more expressly his future exercise of royal authority: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works. And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (St. Matt. vii. 21, 22). The tenor of the whole is summed up by the evangelist in the remark at the close: "He taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes." It was, throughout, the voice of Christ, as the Sovereign Lawgiver and the Eternal King.

VIII. The record of the miracles, chap. viii., has a peculiar tone. They are given briefly, with little of historic detail, in a sententious and abstract form. In the healing of the leper, the word of power is most conspicuous: "I will, be thou clean." In the cure of the centurion's servant, the chief feature is a regal authority over all disease, illustrated by the centurion's authority over his soldiers and servants; with a prophecy of the wide range of Messiah's kingdom, and the exclusion of the unfaithful from its blessings. Even the numerous cures are recorded in a peculiar aspect, not as the simple results of Divine compassion, but as the fulfilment of one predicted character of the true Messiah. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses" (St. Matt. viii. 17). The crossing of the lake is marked, in this gospel alone, as the result of an express command; and the brief account of the storm has for its main feature his absolute dominion over the winds and the waves. The same tone is conspicuous in the cure of the demoniacs. It is brief, sententious, and solemn. No

The Series of
Miracles.

secondary details are introduced, but simply the humbling appeal of the wicked spirits, and the word of power, with its immediate issues, that reveal the royal dominion and majesty of the Lord Jesus.

Having thus set before us the king of Israel in a sevenfold series of works of power, the writer reverts (in chap. ix.), as we have seen,¹ to an earlier point of time, and presents a further series, also sevenfold, of works of power linked and combined with messages of grace. We have first, in the cure of the palsy, his authority, as the Son of man, to forgive all sins, ratified by the healing of bodily disease. We have next, in the call of Matthew, and the answer to the Pharisees, the power and grace of Christ, as the physician of souls, with his power to secure the willing obedience of sinners. We have, thirdly, his authority, as king, to loose the heavy burden of ceremonial restraints and Pharisaic tradition. Fourthly, in the healing of the issue, we have a voice of comfort to weak and timorous faith. Fifthly, in the raising of the ruler's daughter, we have his dominion over death. Finally, in the cure of the blind man, and of the dumb demoniac, we have his kingly character as the promised Son of David, and the testimony of the general conscience to his works, as surpassing all the wonders which God had wrought, even amongst his chosen people Israel, in the days of old; with a warning of the unbelief and blasphemy, by which the leaders of the Jews would reject and disown their rightful Sovereign.

The Apostolic
Commission.

IX. The Apostolic Commission (chap. x.) is another distinctive portion of the first gospel. Its tone, throughout, is the proclamation of a coming kingdom by public heralds. It is prefaced by the statement, that Jesus went about all the cities and villages, preaching the glad tidings of the kingdom. It opens with the charge to the twelve: "As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." It continues with a warning of the day of judgment, and the promise, "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Our Lord speaks in

¹ See Table, p. 4.

it with the tone of a victorious conqueror: "Think not that I am come to send peace upon the earth; I am not come to send peace, but a sword." And it closes with an assurance from the King to his servants, even in the humblest and meanest acts of obedience, of a blessed and full reward.

X. The sevenfold series of parables, chap. xiii., are the next distinctive portion of this gospel. Of these, two only are recorded by St. Mark, and only the first, on this occasion, by St. Luke, who also records two others on a later repetition. Now these seven parables all refer to the kingdom of heaven. They even appear to constitute a complete prophetic series, from the first seed-time of the gospel, in the days of our Lord and his apostles, to the final ingathering and great separation, in the last days of the Christian Church. The first of them, which is common to the two other gospels, has no special reference to our Lord's kingly office. But in the parable of the tares, and of the net cast into the sea, this reference is most manifest. The whole series exhibits, in a striking manner, the two features of present forbearance, with the final exercise of righteous judgment, when the Son of man shall openly assume his kingdom, and reign for ever. In this gospel alone there is an express reference to the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy in the blindness of the Jews, where it is connected with the judgment upon them of political desolation (chap. xiii. 14; cf. Is. vi. 9).

The Series of Parables.

XI. The structure of the gospel, in this irregular portion, where alone there is a serious deviation from the order of time by any of the four writers, may be simply explained by this view of its special design. A revelation of our Lord, as the true King, would naturally imply the following main features, and lead to the order in which they are presented in this gospel. I. The Laws and Ordinances of the Righteous King, chap. v.-vii. II. The Authority of the King, shown in his power over ceremonial pollution, viii. 2-4, all varieties of disease, viii. 5-17, his own disciples, ver. 18-23, the elements of nature, ver. 23-27, and the spirits of darkness, ver. 28-34. III. The Gracious Character

The structure of the whole irregular section of the gospel may be accounted for by this special design.

of the King, in his forgiveness of sin, ix. 2-8, in his grace to publicans and sinners, ix. 9-13, his removal of burdens, ver. 14-17, his encouragement of timorous faith, ver. 20-22, his power to deliver from death, ver. 18-26, his compassion to all suppliants for his grace, ver. 27-35. IV. The Open Proclamation of his Kingdom, chap. x. V. Its Relation to the Divine Precursors of its approach, chap. xi. VI. Its Actual Conflict with Jewish rebellion and unbelief, chap. xii. Its Future Development and Final Triumph, chap. xiii. There is thus a doctrinal and moral completeness in this irregular portion of the gospel, when contemplated with reference to the spiritual design of the whole narrative.

The Stater in
the Fish's
Mouth.

XII. The course of events which follow, till the Transfiguration, and which are given in order of time, refer to the common object of all the gospels, rather than to the especial revelation of our Lord's kingly office, though traces of its peculiar character are still apparent. Thus the passage, Matt. xv. 29-31, compared with the incident in Mark vii. 31-37, and the account of Peter's walking on the sea, xiv. 28-23, have a distinctive air of calm, royal majesty. But this feature comes to light again more plainly at the close of this middle portion of the gospels. The incident of the tribute-money (chap. xvii. 24-27), which is given in this gospel only, has a direct and immediate reference to the claim of our Lord, as the rightful King of Israel; while the parable xviii. 23-35, unfolds the principles of his government, when he will take account of his servants, and render judgment without mercy to the unmerciful.

The Parables
of Judgment.

XIII. Several marks of this peculiar relation to our Lord's kingly office appear in the following chapters, until the close of his public ministry. Here alone we find the promise to the apostles fully given: "In the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (St. Matt. xix. 28). Here alone we find the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, of which the chief lesson is the exercise of Divine sovereignty in the outward administration of the kingdom of God; and that of the king who made a marriage for his son. The entrance

into Jerusalem is marked, more fully than in the other gospels, as the direct fulfilment of prophecy, and the coming of the promised King of Zion. The woes on the scribes and Pharisees are summed up in the language of a monarch, whose care has been despised, and his authority disowned, and who was about to forsake his people, until the time when they should welcome their rightful sovereign (xxiii. 34-39).¹ Finally, the parables, chap. xxv., refer entirely to our Lord's work of judgment; and the passage, xxv. 31, 34, 40, is perhaps the only place where he expressly claims to himself this emphatic title of "the King."

XIV. Again, the brief account of the Resurrection, in this gospel, bears a peculiar impress of royal majesty. The mighty angel, whose presence terrifies the soldiers, is only one of the ministering servants of the true king, and invites the women in those expressive words, "Come, see the place where the Lord lay" (xxviii. 6). The abrupt account of the appearance to the women, and the message given them, are the description and message of a king. The parting commission, which forms the closing sentence of the gospel, is a proclamation by our Lord of his supreme authority and lasting dominion: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world. Amen" (xxviii. 19, 20). The gospel begins with the character of Messiah, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the promised King of the Jews; and it closes with the full glory of his universal dominion over heaven and earth.

The Story of
the Risen
Lord.

XV. Thus the first gospel, in every part, bears the marks of a secret and spiritual unity. It is emphatically the gospel of the kingdom. It sets before us the Lord Jesus, in his predicted character as the Righteous Branch, whom the

Summary.

¹ Thus Godet calls the gospel of St. Matthew "the ultimatum of Jehovah to His ancient people" ("Studies in N. T.," p. 23).—Ed.

Lord would raise up to David, the King who should reign and prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth. The style throughout answers to this purpose of the narrative. It is brief, sententious, and authoritative; sparing in all the minuter details of our Lord's history, in his more tender utterances of loving sympathy, or higher revelations of his Divine glory; but copious, full, and various, in its exhibitions of his moral purity, his holy commandments, his warnings of judgment, his denunciations of woe against iniquity, and his promises of future recompense to his faithful servants. It begins with the promise to David, and the lowly reverence of the wise men before the infant Jesus, and leads our thoughts, in its closing sentences, to the gathering of all nations before the judgment-seat of the eternal King.

CHAPTER II.

ON THE IDEAL CHARACTER OF THE SECOND GOSPEL.

THE gospel of St. Mark, viewed in its historical origin, has been proved to be the second in order of time; the work of John Mark, the companion of Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, but especially of Peter, a Jew by birth, a Roman probably by early association and citizenship, as well as by surname; and written in Palestine during the second stage of the early church, when a class of Roman military converts, of whom Cornelius is an example, had been added to the first ingathering of Jewish believers. As a second witness, its purpose was to confirm, rather than to supplement, the previous gospel of St. Matthew; while the marks of an eyewitness, so apparent in many places, and the special relation to St. Peter, alike in what it mentions or conceals, confirm the tradition that it was composed under the inspection, or from the oral narratives, of that great apostle. It is thus, as Da Costa has very justly observed, the fruit of two testimonies, which meet, coalesce, and mutually confirm each other, the testimony of St. Peter and of St. Matthew (Da Costa, "Four Witnesses," p. 66). Yet this very resemblance to the first gospel, in nearly all the separate facts which it records, and which has led some to call it, though quite incorrectly, an abridgment of the other, renders its composition less easy to explain, without some further purpose beyond the mere want of a second testimony. But if we can discern, throughout the work, the unity of a new spiritual aspect, in which it exhibits the life of Jesus, we shall have obtained a full explanation, on the one hand, of its likeness to St. Matthew in the facts it reveals, and on

Summary of
outward re-
lationships of
St. Mark.

the other, of its variations and omissions, and frequent expansions of his narrative, from the peculiar aspect of our Lord's character which it was designed to portray.

Distinctive
spiritual
character.
The gospel of
unwearied
activity and
persevering
diligence.

The second living creature, in the Apocalypse, was like a calf or young ox, the natural symbol of strength to labour, and of persevering diligence, in connection with all the various work of spiritual husbandry. This meaning is clearly taught by the apostle, in his exposition of the Divine precept: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." "Doth God," he inquires, "care for oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes it is written, that he who ploweth should plow in hope, and he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope" (1 Cor. ix. 9, 10). Contrasted with the eagle, that soars high above the earth, and gazes on the meridian sun, the calf or ox has its eye fixed downward on the earth, while it patiently submits its neck to the yoke of labour, and ploughs the ground for the husbandman, or treads out the corn in the threshing-floor. The spiritual character, thus implied, is laborious diligence in present, immediate duty, a readiness to stoop to all the details of earthly life, and a dominion over external nature; without the memories that belong to the distant past, or anticipations of the remote future, or a penetrating glance into the loftier mysteries of heavenly truth.

The second gospel, if this emblem describes its character, will be a gospel of the personal ministry of Jesus, in the days of his humiliation. It will abound in the details of his works of love, of his active and outward life, with few references to ancient prophecy, or deep utterances of human sympathy, or express revelations of his higher glory, as the eternal Son of God. It will be a practical, homely, earnest gospel, full of action rather than of discourse, of minute and graphic history, rather than of brief and comprehensive statements. It will set before us the character of the Lord Jesus in his dominion over outward nature, and the unwearied activity of his daily ministry here below. This spiritual character, also, agrees well with its historical adaptation to Roman converts. For the emblem of the

fourth empire is iron (Dan. ii. 40, etc.), the metal of practical, working men. The Roman mind dwelt little on the shadowy memories of the past, or anticipations of the distant future, or on lofty speculations respecting the higher mysteries of our being. In the sphere of outward activity alone, their power was immense, and has everywhere left enduring monuments of its greatness. It remains to inquire how far the spiritual features, implied in this cherubic symbol, are actually revealed in St. Mark's narrative.

I. And first, the gospel of St. Mark, compared with that of St. Matthew, is distinguished by its sparing introduction of our Lord's discourses, and a more copious description of his various miracles. In the one, we have thirteen chapters, almost entirely composed of the sayings of Jesus; in the other, scarcely three such chapters are found. If the account of our Lord's infancy, and the longer discourses were removed, the first gospel would become considerably shorter than the second, instead of greatly exceeding it in size. Even those discourses, which St. Mark has retained, are compressed into one half of their length, as given in the earlier gospel. This remarkable contrast agrees with the spiritual purpose, which has been just ascribed to the second narrative, as a revelation of the Lord Jesus in his dominion over nature, and in the outward, practical activity of his works of love.

II. Again, the opening of the second gospel has a very distinct and peculiar character. It neither dwells on the pre-existent glory of the Word, like the fourth gospel, nor on the records of the infancy of Jesus, like those of St. Matthew and St. Luke, but enters at once on the public ministry of John, his herald and forerunner, and passes on rapidly, after a few verses, to the account of his own public preaching and labours. Its commencement is abrupt, and carries us at once into the midst of the busy scene of his appointed ministry. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God: As it is written in the prophets, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness,

This is exemplified—
1. In the sparing introduction of discourses.

2. In the abrupt commencement with the outward ministry

Prepare ye the way of the Lord ; make his paths straight." The prediction, first quoted, describes our Lord as the messenger of the covenant, or the Prophet by whom God was pleased to reveal his will to mankind. The evangelist then hastens on to his main subject, and from the fourteenth verse enters at once on the labours of our Lord, in the active and earnest proclamation of the kingdom of God.

3. The use of the imperfect tense and adverb *ἐνθίως*.

III. A characteristic feature of this gospel, from the first, is the use of terms denoting continued action. Thus in the very first verse of direct history, the title of John, in Matthew, is transformed into a description of his daily employment. "John was baptizing in the wilderness, and preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." The same form recurs, i. 6, 10, 15, 21, 22, 39 ; ii. 2, 13, 18 ; iii. 12, 13 ; iv. 2, 33 ; vi. 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 56, and is thus a peculiar feature of this gospel, which gives a fuller tone to the whole narrative.

Another character, which has been often noticed, is the use of the word *ἐνθίως*, which occurs here twenty-seven times, eight times in St. Matthew, and twice only in St. Luke. Its frequency, which seems to detract a little from the elegance of the style, gives a peculiar tone of swiftness and incessant activity to the whole narrative. We pass continually from one incident to another, from the petition of the suppliant, to the work of mercy that followed ; from the return of Jesus, to the thronging of the multitudes ; from the secret thought in the heart of his enemies, to the prompt and speedy reply ; from the utterance of his words of power, to their instant efficacy. We are thus carried on in a perpetual current of living, energetic labour. Procrastination is entirely banished from the picture, here exhibited to us, of the person and ministry of the Son of God.

4. The many graphical details,

IV. Again, the gospel of St. Mark abounds, above all the rest, with graphical and expressive details, which bring before our eyes the very picture of the scene he describes. Thus in i. 7, he adds the brief epithet, "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy, *stooping down*, to unloose." The general expression, "the heavens were opened," is re-

placed by another still more vivid—"he saw the heavens rent asunder" (σχιζομένους) (i. 10). In the brief account of the temptation we find a new fact, which gives a vivid reality to the whole scene—"He was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him" (i. 13). In the call of James and John, it is stated that Jesus had gone *a little further*—"and they left their father Zebedee in the ship, with the hired servants, and followed him" (i. 19, 20). The dispossession at Capernaum is not reported at all by St. Matthew, and when compared with the third gospel, we find an additional incident, both striking and impressive; that, "*when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him*" (i. 26). In the next passage the house is mentioned, as that of Simon and Andrew, and they entered it, *with James and John* (i. 29). The eventide is more clearly defined by the actual sun-setting (ὅτε ἔδυν ὁ ἥλιος), and the graphic account of the cures is given, that "*all the city was gathered together at the door*" (i. 32-34). The departure of Jesus, and the search of his disciples, are very minutely described—"And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed. And Simon, and they that were with him, followed after him" (i. 35-38). In the cure of the leper, the account is rendered more vivid by the description of his kneeling down to Jesus, and by the brief addition, "*Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth his hand, and touched him*" (i. 40 and fg.). The charge to the leper, which follows, and the effects of his report, are given with equal minuteness of colouring. All these touches of vivid reality are found in the first chapter only, and they are equally numerous and striking in the rest of the gospel. They are especially conspicuous in the voyage to Gadara, the cure of the demoniac, of the woman with the issue, and the raising of the daughter of Jairus, and in the later dispossession, which follows the account of the Transfiguration.

V. Another feature of St. Mark's gospel is the introduction of phrases and names, which give a dramatic reality and vividness to the narrative. Thus, in the call of Mat-

5. Special names and phrases.

thew, ii. 14, he describes him doubly, by his Jewish name, and the name of his father. "He saw *Levi, the son of Alpheus*, sitting at the receipt of custom" (St. Mark ii. 14). In our Lord's quotation, with regard to David's conduct, ii. 26, the brief circumstance is added, that it was *in the days of Abiathar the high priest*. In the plots of the enemies of Jesus, iii. 6, *the Herodians* are mentioned along with the Pharisees. The multitudes, who then followed Jesus, are noted by the places from which they came, Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem, Idumea, Perea, Tyre and Sidon (iii. 7, 8). In the list of the twelve apostles, he alone gives the surname, *Boanerges*, of the two sons of Zebedee (iii. 17). In the account of the storm, he gives the very words of Jesus, *Peace, be still* (iv. 39). He mentions the district, in which the dispossessed of Gadara published his cure. "He began to publish *in Decapolis*, how great things Jesus had done for him" (v. 20). He gives the name of the ruler, *Jairus*, whose daughter was raised (v. 22), and the very words of Jesus, *Talitha Cumi*, by which the resurrection of the child was effected (ver. 41). After the miracle of the loaves, he specifies that the disciples were sent over before unto *Bethsaida* (vi. 45). He reports, once again, the Syriac term, *Ephphatha*, used in the cure of the deaf man in Decapolis (vii. 34). In the request of the sons of Zebedee (x. 35), he twice repeats the names, omitted in St. Matthew, and gives the name and parentage of the blind man at Jericho, *Bartimeus*, the son of Timeus, and introduces the Syriac term, *Rabboni*, in his reply to Jesus (x. 46, 51). He alone mentions the four disciples, Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, whose inquiry led to the prophecy on the Mount of Olives (xiii. 3). In like manner he alone records of Simon the Cyrenian, that he was *the father of Alexander and Rufus* (xv. 21, 40), and first mentions the name of the wife of Zebedee, *Salome*. All these particulars give to his narrative a peculiar air of intimate knowledge and truthful reality.

6. Notices of
gesture and
outward
appearance.

VI. This gospel abounds, also, in allusions to the external gestures and deportment of Jesus. In the cure of Simon's wife's mother, "he took her by the hand, and lifted her

up" (i. 31), a detail not so fully given by St. Matthew. In the cure of the withered hand, "he looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts" (iii. 5). Soon after, we have the graphic description—"He spake to the disciples, that a small ship should wait upon him, because of the multitude, lest they should throng him; for he had healed many, so that they pressed on him for to touch him, as many as had plagues" (iii. 9). Another picture of the same kind presently follows—"He goeth up into the mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would, and they came to him" (iii. 13). Again, on the visit of his mother and brethren, we are told that "he looked round about on them that sat about him" (iii. 34), before his expressive reply. Before the voyage we have the significant detail, that "they took him, even as he was, in the ship; and there were also with him other little ships" (iv. 36), and when the storm arose, "he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep upon the cushion" (iv. 38). In the cure of the issue, we have the statement, "He looked round about, to see her that had done this thing" (v. 32). The mode in which the cures were wrought at Nazareth is also described—"He laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them" (vi. 5). In the miracle in Decapolis, when the deaf man was healed, "he put his fingers in his ears, and spat, and touched his tongue, and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith to him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened" (vii. 33). When the Pharisees require a sign, we are told that "he sighed deeply in his spirit" (viii. 12). Before his public rebuke of Peter, "he turned about and looked upon his disciples," and afterwards "called the people to him, with his disciples also," before he gives the further admonition (viii. 33, 34). The description of his Transfiguration is in homely, but most vivid phrases. "His raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth could white them" (ix. 3). A lingering glory on his countenance is implied, on his descent from the mountain. "All the people, when they beheld him, were greatly amazed, and running to him, saluted him" (ix. 15). Even in the cure

of the child, the descriptive addition appears—"But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up, and he arose" (ix. 27). And again, in the dispute about precedence, we find it mentioned, here only, that "when he was in the house," before he was seated, "he asked them what they disputed upon in the way;" that he then "sat down and called the twelve" to him; and that he not only "took a child and set him in the midst," as the other evangelist also tells us, but also "took him in his arms," before his touching and grave appeal to the apostles (ix. 33-37). The same striking detail is repeated, x. 16, on a similar occasion, when he blessed the little children. "He took them up in his arms, and put his hand upon them." When the young ruler went away sorrowful, again "Jesus looked round about on his disciples" (x. 23), before he drew for them that instructive and awakening lesson, on the danger of earthly riches. Another graphical description soon follows, which is also found here only. "They were in the way going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus went before them, and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid" (x. 32). In the entry into the city, we have the description more minutely given than elsewhere. "They that *went before*, and they that *followed*, cried, saying, Hosanna" (xi. 9); and it is noted here only that Jesus, on his first entrance into the temple, "looked round about upon all things" (xi. 11). It is mentioned, also, that "he was *walking in the temple*," when the chief priests questioned him respecting his authority (xi. 27); while the incident of the widow's mite is given with similar minuteness of description (xii. 41 and fg.). There is thus no gospel which gives such ample materials for a picture of the daily, outward life of the Lord Jesus.

7. The two distinctive miracles.

VII. There are two miracles of our Lord which are related in this gospel only, and these are both marked by the same character, of graphic and minute detail.

vii. 32. "And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech, and beseech him to put his hand on him. And he took him aside from the multitude, and put his fingers in his ears, and he spit and

touched his tongue. And looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. And immediately his ears were opened, and the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain. And he charged them that they should tell no man; but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it, and were beyond measure astonished, saying, He hath done all things well, he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak."

viii. 22. "And he cometh to Bethsaida, and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him. And he took the blind man by the hand, and led him out of the town, and when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought. And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking. After that he put his hands again upon his eyes, and made him look up; and he was restored and saw every man clearly."

The former of these answers in position to Matt. xv. 29-31, where a number of miracles are grouped together in one general statement; and shows in a striking manner, by contrast, the individualizing and graphical character of the second gospel, and the patient and laborious detail of our Lord's daily ministry. The other belongs to an interval of which no incident is given in the other gospels, a short journey from the lake of Tiberias to the north-eastern part of Galilee; and, besides its own pictorial character, serves to link together the geographical relations of the previous and the following parts of our Saviour's ministry. It stands alone, also, in its picture of a cure effected in two successive stages, and thus rendered more analogous to the ordinary processes of medical restoration. The miracles of Jesus are thus brought into closer contact with the heart, as encouragements to the quiet, sedulous activity of Christian love, and perseverance in seemingly imperfect or unsuccessful labours.

VIII. There are three incidents, again, which are not found in St. Matthew, but which are common to St. Mark and St. Luke; the dispossession in Capernaum, the question of John the Apostle, and the widow's mite (Mark i.

8. The three incidents, common to Mark and Luke alone.

21-29; ix. 38-50; xii. 41-44). The first of these, besides its power of description in itself, connects the call of the apostles with the cure of Simon's mother-in-law, and thus gives a deeper tone of historical reality to the whole course of events at the opening of our Lord's ministry, which is still further increased by the account which follows, of the retirement of Jesus the next morning (Mark i. 35). The second is the only instance, in the three first gospels, of a conversation in which any other disciple but Peter is introduced by name, and thus serves to temper the prominence of that apostle in the first gospel; which is still further done, by omitting the promise after his confession, his walking on the water, and the incident of the tribute money. The third is peculiarly suited to explain the simple and natural character of our Lord's teaching, and its growth out of passing incidents as they arose.

9. The record
of the Resur-
rection.

IX. The close of the gospel has the same distinctive features which have been traced throughout its whole course. The visit of the women to the sepulchre, compared with St. Matthew, has a greater minuteness of detail, and, without the same air of royal majesty, has a remarkable tone of reality, and of accurate and careful knowledge. The mention of Salome along with the two Maries, the purpose for which they came, their preparation of spices after the Sabbath was past, the early hour at which they set out to the tomb, their questioning among themselves about the removal of the stone, their unexpected discovery that it was rolled away, their entrance into the sepulchre, the position and vesture of the angel, their sudden fear and his encouraging answer, their unabated alarm, which makes them flee from the sepulchre, and unfits them, for a time, to communicate the message; are all features of the narrative, which correspond exactly to the spiritual purpose of the whole gospel, and complete the visible picture of our Lord's ministry, from his abode with wild beasts in the wilderness to the hour when angels once again minister to their risen Lord.

The brief summary which follows, though more comprehensive, retains still the same characteristic attention to

external details and the individual acts of our Lord's ministry. Instead of one main and one subordinate appearance, as in St. Matthew and St. Luke, we have here three in distinct succession. The first is to Mary Magdalene alone, who is described by the cure she has already received, and it is connected with the only express statement of the exact time of the resurrection. It is followed by a graphic description of the weeping disciples, and of their incredulity when she brings her startling message. The second appearance is mentioned, with its main characteristics, that the two disciples were walking from Jerusalem into the country, and that Jesus appeared to them in another form. We have then the appearance to the apostles the same evening, and the circumstance is added that they were reclining at their evening meal, and that Jesus rebuked them gravely for their previous unbelief.

The commission, which closes the whole gospel, has the same features, of our Lord's dominion over external nature, and his character as the persevering Teacher and Prophet, stamped upon it with great clearness. The very phrase used for the objects of the gospel message, compared with St. Matthew, is very significant. In the first gospel, the command is to teach "all the nations," and men are thus viewed in their national and political character, as the subjects of Messiah's kingly sceptre. Here the charge is given, "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." Man is thus identified with all the lower creation, and all are inclusively regarded as the objects of the Divine message. The external signs are then given, which would attest the new revelation, and prove the subjection of all nature to the authority of its Lord. And, last of all, even after the ascension of Jesus, he is still described by this double character—the ruler over all lower creatures, and the constant and unwearied fellow-worker with his own servants in their daily ministry of love. "So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, THE LORD WORKING WITH THEM AND CONFIRMING THE WORD BY SIGNS FOLLOWING.

10. The closing words.

AMEN." As the first gospel closed with a sublime proclamation of his regal sovereignty, to whom all power is given in heaven and earth, the gospel of St. Mark exhibits here, with equal prominence, the unwearied and powerful energy of the Lord Jesus in the perpetual diffusion of Divine truth, and in all those various works of spiritual husbandry which shall issue at length in a precious harvest of immortal souls.

CHAPTER III.

ON THE SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL.

THE third gospel, if it corresponds to the spiritual meaning of the third cherubic symbol, with the face of a man, will exhibit our Lord in his human sympathy, benevolence, and compassion. It will present him to the church as the true High Priest, who was touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. The message of heaven will assume its most attractive and winning aspect, as one of grace to sinners, and the human love of Jesus will be peculiarly displayed in the whole history.

This gospel, like that of St. Matthew, begins with the infancy of Jesus. Yet even here there is a striking contrast. Instead of his royal genealogy, through the line of Jewish kings, it begins with the message of an angel to Zacharias, a priest of the course of Abia, whose wife Elisabeth was of the daughters of Aaron. The scene opens amidst the sacred services of the Jewish temple, and Gabriel appears to Zacharias, while he fulfils his lot in the order of his course, at the right side of the golden incense-altar. The message of Divine mercy, which opens the whole history, is given in answer to the united worship of the people of God. We are reminded, from the first, how the Jewish priesthood, in the person of Zacharias, and the service of the temple, were to lose themselves, like stars in the morning sunlight, in the higher and everlasting priesthood of the Son of God.

Again, the Incarnation is here revealed in connection with the Virgin mother of Jesus, from whom alone his true manhood was derived, and by whom he was made the heir

St. Luke, the gospel of Christ's human sympathies, presents him to us as the Great High Priest.

1. His writing opens with a temple-scene.

2. The greater prominence is given to the Virgin.

of all human sympathies and sorrows. In St. Matthew his reputed father, Joseph, is the more conspicuous, by whom he inherited the royal honours of the kings of Judah. The judicial righteousness is conspicuous in St. Matthew, by which the natural suspicions of Joseph were cleared away, and the innocence of Mary established; while St. Luke exhibits the tenderness of Divine grace in the angelic salutation—"Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women" (St. Luke i. 28).

3. As the gospel of worship it preserves the Christian hymns.

Another striking feature in these early chapters is the repeated songs of praise. The worship of God is the main work of the priestly office, and the distinctive honour of man. In this gospel alone these utterances of praise abound. The song of Elisabeth is followed by that of Mary, and this again by the hymn of Zacharias, the worship of the angels at Bethlehem, and the song of the aged Simeon. From first to last the same tone is maintained. This gospel, above the others, resounds everywhere with voices of praise and thanksgiving.

4. It gives us scenes of home in its account of our Lord's Incarnation and Infancy.

It is plain, again, in this first chapter, how we are introduced into the quiet scenes and changes of domestic life. We have the father and mother of the Baptist, the Virgin Mary, the relations and kinsfolk, the deliberations on the name of the infant, the joy and wonder of his parents and friends, when the dumbness of Zacharias was removed, all set vividly before us. We are taught, from the first, how truly Jesus became one of ourselves, and are ushered into the homes of his childhood, and quiet scenes of domestic love.

The account of the Nativity, chapter ii., has the very same character. It reveals to us One who was in all points made like unto his brethren. It shows us that the Son of Man, even at his birth, entered on his deep humiliation, and had not where to lay his head. It exhibits the Holy Child, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in the manger, the visit of the shepherds, men of low degree, and not eastern sages or kings, and the humbling rites of circumcision, and purification with the sin-offering in the

temple for the infant Saviour. It tells us how the aged Simeon took the infant in his arms, while he blessed God for his mercy to his people, and that "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was with him" (ii. 40). It mentions the visit to the Passover, at twelve years of age, the anxiety of his mother for the young child, and his willing subjection to his reputed parents. All these things reveal to us, in a striking manner, the condescension of the Lord, and how truly he stooped in all respects to our low estate; while the whole is crowned by the sentence at the close, so expressive of his true humanity. "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man" (ii. 52).

The ministry of the Baptist is introduced, in this gospel, with several characteristic features. It is defined in the date of its commencement by the Jewish high priests, and by the character of John himself, as a Jewish priest, the son of Zacharias, whose temple-service and vision have been recorded before. The prophecy of Isaiah is more fully quoted, so as to close with the anticipation of the gospel's universal triumph. "All flesh shall see the salvation of God" (iii. 6). The stern warning, common to St. Matthew, is mitigated by the instructions given here to each class of inquirers, which are a simple earnest of the grace of the gospel in its application to the common duties of daily life. In the baptism of our Lord, we find here only the significant addition, that Jesus was praying (iii. 21), when the heavens were opened, and the Spirit of God, in answer to his own prayer, descended upon him. The genealogy then follows, which external and internal evidence proves to be that which ascends through Mary, his real mother. Instead of closing with Abraham, the forefather of the Jews, it mounts up to Adam, the forefather of the whole human race; and thus reminds us that Jesus is really the brother of all men, and the promised Redeemer of the whole family of mankind.

In the temptation of our Lord, when compared with the account in St. Matthew, the priestly character of St. Luke's gospel is again apparent. The climax is found, not in the

5. The Mission
of the Baptist.

6. The Genea-
logy.

7. The Temp-
tation.

offer of all the kingdoms of the world, but when our Lord is brought to Jerusalem, and set there on the pinnacle of the temple, while the words at the close allude to the renewal of the spiritual conflict in the last agony and sufferings of the Redeemer. "And when the devil had ended every temptation, he departed from him for a season" (iv. 13). The words contain an expressive intimation of the Saviour's personal experience, as our High Priest, who was tempted in all points like unto his brethren, only without sin.

8. The First
Preaching at
Nazareth.

The opening of his public ministry, in this gospel, is rich with humanelements of compassion and grace. We are introduced at once to Nazareth, the home of his infancy, and see him, according to his custom in previous years of quiet retirement, frequenting the synagogue on the Sabbath-day. Instead of the brief and solemn warning, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," we have a gentler and more attractive message. "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord" (iv. 18-20). This is not the stern voice of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, denouncing speedy judgment on the impenitent; or of the righteous Lawgiver, enforcing the claims of Divine holiness, as in the Sermon on the Mount; but reveals all the human sympathies of Jesus, in their tenderest utterances of compassion to the sinful and wretched. And hence we are told that "all bare him record, and wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his lips" (iv. 22).

In the rest of the narrative the same tone of thought and feeling is maintained. The title by which he virtually introduces himself to the men of Nazareth is, the Great Physician. The reference to the prophets illustrates the wide purpose of the gospel, as a message of grace to all mankind, and not to the Jews alone. The mercy shown to the widow of Sarepta, and the cure of Naaman the Syrian, are turned into presentiments of the mercy now about to

visit the whole Gentile world. Even the quiet withdrawal from the fury of the Nazarenes exhibits, in a striking manner, the gentleness and Divine compassion of Jesus, who was willing to be despised and rejected of men, on account of the very grace and mercy which should have endeared him to their hearts.

The history of the miraculous draught, when compared with the brief account of the call of the disciples in the two other gospels, reveals the same distinctive character. There we are struck simply with the authority of Jesus, whose word of command was followed by prompt obedience. Here, on the other hand, the features of condescension and grace, and human sympathy, are most conspicuous. He is not walking alone by the sea, but the people are pressing upon him to hear the word of God. He asks a favour of his own disciple, to thrust out a little from the land, that he may teach the people with more ease from the ship. He then repays the kindness by the instruction, "Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught" (v. 4). When the immense capture is made, no command is given to abandon their prize. The Saviour waits till his disciple falls down at his feet, in awe and wonder, and exclaims, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord" (v. 8). The answer then comes, not as before, in a command of Divine authority, but simply in a gracious encouragement, and attended with the promise of a higher blessing. "Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men" (v. 10). The miracle itself revealed his Divine power, but all the circumstances are full of human grace and tenderness, by which the trembling and astonished sinner is invited to regard the Lord of glory as his own bosom friend. There is thus also a farther token that the events are distinct and successive. The Saviour first summons the disciples with kingly authority, and they yield him a prompt obedience. He afterwards allures them by a bright exhibition of his power and grace; and, without any word of command, they are drawn to him, more powerfully than ever, by the cords of human sympathy and of grateful love.

Another striking feature, which runs through the whole

9. The First
Miraculous
Draught.

10. The men-
tion of Jesus

as a wor-
shipper.

gospel, is the view of our Lord himself as a worshipper. One instance, at his baptism, has been already noticed. After the cure of the leper, which follows the miraculous draught, we are told that "he withdrew into desert places, and prayed" (v. 16). The words, in the original, imply that this was his habitual practice (*ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσευχόμενος*), and do not refer to one single occasion alone. After the cure of the withered hand, and before the ordination of the Twelve Apostles, "he went out into the mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God" (vi. 12). The remarkable confession of Peter is given in all the three gospels, but only St. Luke tells us that Jesus was "alone praying" before he put the inquiry to his disciples which occasioned Peter's reply (ix. 18). They all recount the transfiguration; but only St. Luke informs us, that Jesus went up into the mountain to PRAY, before the vision of his glory (ix. 28). We are told, again, that he was praying in a certain place, when his disciples made the request—"Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples" (xi. 1). How different the tone of human gentleness and condescension, by which the prayer is thus introduced, from the royal dignity of the charge which precedes and follows it in the sermon in St. Matthew! The stress, in one case, is laid on the righteousness of God, who will deny forgiveness to the unmerciful; and in the other, on the prevailing power of earnest and importunate supplication. A distinct parable is afterwards given, in St. Luke's gospel only, to enforce the privilege of unwearied prayer, and another, to show the peculiar efficacy of such prayer from the contrite and broken-hearted sinner (xviii. 1-14). The prayer of our Lord himself in Gethsemane is more fully recorded, with the touching addition—"And being in an agony, he prayed the more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground" (xxii. 44). Even on the cross, three out of seven sayings of our Lord are given in this gospel, and two of these are prayers, while the third is a most gracious promise, in answer to the prayer of a penitent—"Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." "Verily,

I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (xxiii. 34, 43, 46). From first to last the gospel reveals to us that blessed High Priest, "who in the days of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, and was heard in that he feared" (Heb. v. 7).

St. Luke, again, as the physician, presents in strong relief the healing power of the Saviour, not only by the title of Physician, in the first opening of his ministry at Nazareth, but in repeated allusions to the healing virtue which flowed from his body. Thus we read, vi. 19, that "the whole multitude sought to touch him, for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all." And again, in the cure of the woman with the issue, we have the reply to his disciples—"Some one hath touched me, for I perceive that virtue has gone out from me" (viii. 46). The works of healing are thus exhibited, not so much in the aspect of free and sovereign benefits, bestowed at pleasure, but as a spontaneous effluence from the fulness of his grace.

11. As a Physician.

The character of human sympathy in this gospel is further marked by the prominent mention of women, and especially of widows. Thus, from the very first, we are introduced to Elisabeth, the wife of Zacharias, of the daughters of Aaron, and to the virgin mother of Jesus. At the presentation, we have not only the song of the aged Simeon, but a response from Anna the prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, "a widow of fourscore and four years, who departed not from the temple, but served God with fasting and prayers night and day" (ii. 37). The first discourse of our Lord, in this gospel, makes honourable mention of the widow of Sarepta, to whom Elias was sent in the time of famine. Here alone the touching incident is recorded of the widow of Nain, whose only son was carried out for burial, when "the Lord saw her, and had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not" (vii. 13), and after the miraculous resurrection of the young man, "delivered him to his mother" (vii. 15). Here too we have the description of the "woman that was a sinner" (vii. 37), her contrition and faith, her deep love to Jesus, and the gracious answer which she re-

12. In his intercourse with women.

ceived. In the circuit of Galilee that followed, we are told that the Twelve were with him, and the narrative then continues—"And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary, called Magdalene, out of whom had gone seven devils, and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, who ministered to him of their substance" (viii. 2-3). This striking feature in our Lord's history, his dependence for support on the charity of female disciples, so expressive of his tender sympathy and deep condescension, is found recorded in this gospel alone. Here also we are first introduced to the beloved sisters, Martha and Mary, who receive Jesus into their house on his journey (x. 38). We have a miracle of healing on the woman who had an infirmity (xiii. 11), and the parable of the unjust judge and importunate widow (xviii. 2). We have mention, at the crucifixion, of the women who wept and bewailed him, and the touching answer of Jesus—"Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children" (xxiii. 28). Last of all, we have here the fullest report of the visit to the sepulchre by the larger company of women who had followed our Lord from Galilee to Jerusalem (xxiv. 1-11). The same feature appears in the Book of Acts, which opens with the description of the first apostolic company. "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, WITH THE WOMEN, AND MARY THE MOTHER OF JESUS, and with his brethren" (Acts i. 14).

13. The parables have a domestic character.

The parables, in St. Luke's gospel, have a domestic character, and a peculiar gentleness of tone. In the Good Samaritan, we find sectarian jealousy, and priestly selfishness, set in full contrast with the claims of universal brotherhood (x. 30). The efficacy of prayer is enforced by a domestic picture, of a friend who applies at midnight for the gift of three loaves, because another friend has arrived unexpectedly to be his guest (xi. 5). The rich man, whose ground brought forth plentifully, offers another picture of daily life (xii. 16). The parable of the mustard-seed receives here a more familiar turn, by the scene being transferred to the garden, instead of the field (xiii. 19). The parables

of the woman who hides the leaven in three measures of meal (xiii. 20-21); of the householder who rises and shuts the door (xiii. 25); of the wedding, and the choice of the highest seat (xii. 35, xiv. 8, 16); of the man who made a supper, and the excuses of the guests; of the shepherd, the housewife, the prodigal (xv. 3, 8, 11), and the steward (xvi. 1), have all the same quiet and domestic tone. There is a gentle and familiar grace, which distinguishes them from those of the first gospel, and renders them a peculiarly rich unfolding of the compassion and human condescension of the Lord Jesus.

It is another peculiarity of this gospel, that our Lord is more plainly set before us in his social intercourse with all classes of men. The feast in the publican's house is more fully described than in the other gospels (v. 29). The invitation of the Pharisee, when he went in and sat down to meat, and the woman anointed his feet with ointment (vii. 36); the preparation for him in a Samaritan village (ix. 52); his entertainment by Martha in her own house, and her care about much serving (x. 40); the second invitation by a Pharisee, when those severe warnings against hypocrisy were uttered (xi. 37); his meal in the house of one of the chief Pharisees on the Sabbath-day (xiv. 1); his stay in the house of Zaccheus (xix. 5), and the evening sojourn with the disciples at Emmaus after the resurrection, are all found in this gospel alone (xxiv. 29-35). Here only the important fact is clearly described, that Jesus ate and drank with his disciples after he rose from the dead (xxiv. 41). Our Lord is thus exhibited, throughout, with all the characteristic features of real and sympathizing humanity.

The close of this third gospel remarkably agrees with the view of its special purpose, which has been deduced from such various and concurrent tokens. Instead of the words of royal authority, which form the parting commission of the Lord in St. Matthew, and the unwearied activity of the risen Saviour in confirming the gospel by outward signs, and by the ministry of all nature, which forms the message in St. Mark's narrative, we have his gracious instruction, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached

14. Our Lord is set before us in his social intercourse with all classes.

15. The gospel ends as it began, with proclaiming a new universal hope, and recording acts of worship in the temple.

in his name among all nations," with a special charge to the apostles to begin at Jerusalem, the very scene of his own rejection and bitter sufferings (xxiv. 47). After this parting message of grace to all mankind, the High Priest reveals himself to his disciples in the very moment when he is taken up from them into heaven. "And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven" (xxiv. 50, 51). The gospel then closes, as it began, with solemn acts of praise and thanksgiving in the temple. "And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God. Amen" (xxiv. 52, 53).

16. Brief summary.
St. Luke
especially the
missionary's
gospel.

The third gospel, then, maintains throughout a spiritual unity. It exhibits our Lord to the view of his Church, not so much in his royal dignity, as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the dispenser of righteous judgment, nor as the patient labourer in the spiritual vineyard, controlling all nature by his miracles, and unwearied in his mighty works of love; but as the SON OF MAN, full of all human sympathies; the true High Priest, touched with the feeling of our infirmities, in whom all the rites of the law and the services of the Jewish temple found their true consummation; who was anointed by the Spirit to preach the gospel to the poor, and to heal the broken-hearted, and to bring a message of forgiving grace, and deep, heavenly compassion, to all the mourners of mankind. The living creature, having the face of a man, is a true emblem of the spiritual character which marks the whole narrative. And hence this gospel of St. Luke, as missionaries have constantly found, is pre-eminently suited to reach the consciences, and touch the hearts of men, in the most remote and various tribes of the great human family.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE TRUTH AND DIVINITY OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

THE gospel of St. John is distinguished from the three others, both in its historical evidence, and its spiritual character. Its authority, as a faithful narrative, does not depend on the early date of its composition, but on the well-attested fact that its writer was one of the twelve apostles, the bosom-friend of the Lord Jesus. It was written, according to Irenæus (Iren. contr. "Hær.," III. i.), near the close of St. John's life, about the time of his return from Patmos, or very near the end of the first century, and has always been received in the church as the undoubted work of that beloved disciple. In modern times, one of the few opponents of its genuineness, after the question had been fully discussed, revoked his own doubts, and submitted to the force of the historical evidence.¹ It was, again, a usual tradition in the time of Clement of Alexandria (Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.," vi. 14), that the purpose of the writer was to unfold the doctrine of our Lord's true Divinity, since the other gospels had dwelt rather on his assumption of humanity, and had made Christ known after the flesh. It was sometimes called, by way of contrast, the gospel after the spirit. The fourth cherubic symbol, of the flying eagle, was constantly applied to the evangelist, because his gospel is marked so clearly, above the rest, by a tone of lofty contemplation, and a direct unveiling of the hidden glory of the Son of God.

But this very excellence of the fourth gospel, which has endeared its message, in every age, to the Christian be-

St. John's gospel, from its late date, and deep theology, more open than the other gospels to the assault of philosophical doubt.

¹ Bretschneider. See Watkin's "Bampton Lectures," p. 179 and fg.

liever, would seem, at first sight, to lay it more open than the rest to doubts and suspicions from the disciples of modern philosophy. A gospel, of which it was the distinct purpose to unfold the Divine glory of the Lord Jesus, and which was written nearly seventy years after his death, may seem, to sceptical eyes, far removed from the ground of sober and solid history into the region of romantic fiction and legendary dreams. And such charges have actually been brought, by some recent critics, against the fourth gospel. The discourses, we are told, are free compositions of the writer. Their gradual transitions, rendered obscure by the mystical depths of meaning in which they lie, transitions in which one thought is developed from another, indicate a pliable, unresisting mass, that proceeds from the store of the writer's own thoughts, and is moulded by his own will. And hence it is less important to unfold the spiritual character of the gospel, which has been proverbial in every age of the church, and must impress every thoughtful reader, than to trace the Divine wisdom, which, even in this fuller and higher exhibition of the glory of Christ, and in the latest gospel, designed rather to supplement than to confirm the others, has given us abundant pledges of the authenticity and historical reality of the whole narrative. Some of these proofs lie on the surface, but others require for their discovery a close and searching examination.

But (1st) it proves itself to be of apostolic authorship.

Let us first consider the internal evidence for the apostolic authorship of the gospel. The writer, like the other evangelists, has nowhere openly mentioned his own name. This feature of modesty belongs to all these messengers of that blessed Saviour, who was meek and lowly in heart, and of whom it was prophesied, "He shall not strive, nor cry, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets" (St. Matt. xii. 19). Yet, as a closer search reveals the name of the three other evangelists, or at least of two of them, by clear and certain inference from their writings, so St. John discovers himself, by indirect, but conclusive evidence, to be the writer of the fourth gospel.

In the last chapter we have a beautiful narrative of an

appearance of Jesus to seven disciples by the sea of Galilee. There were present, we are told, Simon Peter, Thomas called Didymus, Nathanael of Cana of Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples (John xxi. 2). The disciple whom Jesus loved was one of these, and tells us at the close that it is he "which testifieth these things, and wrote these things" (xxi. 24). He is marked here, and also in the previous chapter, by his special intimacy with Peter. They alone ran together to the sepulchre, and it was this disciple who said to Peter, upon the draught of the fishes, "It is the Lord" (xxi. 7); while St. Peter, after his own death has been announced, inquires with regard to this companion alone, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" (xxi. 21). It is thus clear that the disciple represents himself as Simon Peter's most intimate companion and chosen friend.

Now in the earlier gospels we find that Peter, James, and John, were singled out by our Lord repeatedly for peculiar favour. Still further, we read in St. Luke that Peter and John were the two disciples selected by our Lord as his messengers, to prepare the Paschal supper (St. Luke xxii. 8); while, in the Book of Acts, Peter and John went up together to the temple, when the lame man was healed, were imprisoned together by the Sanhedrim, and bore witness to them of Jesus, and reported to their own company the threatenings of the priests. Soon after, it is Peter and John who are sent down together, to confirm the believers in Samaria (Acts iii. 1; iv. 13, 19, 23; viii. 14). And since the sons of Zebedee are expressly stated to have been present at the appearance of Jesus by the sea of Tiberias, the inference is clear and certain, that St. John is the disciple whom Jesus loved, the companion and friend of Peter, and thus indirectly announces himself to be the writer of the gospel.

Another proof, still more delicate, is found near the opening. We are there told that, after the testimony of the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God," two of the disciples heard him speak, and they followed Jesus (St. John i. 37). The minute description that follows is a proof that

one of them was the writer of the gospel, and thus an eyewitness of the scene he describes. "Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi, which is, being interpreted, Master, where dwellest thou? He saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day. It was about the tenth hour" (St. John i. 38-40). The writer thus, in his old age, delights to revive the impressions of the moment which first brought him to the presence of Jesus.

One of these two disciples, we read in the next verse, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. The other, who must have been himself the writer, does not give his own name. Yet it is discovered, in passing, by the words that follow, where it is said of Andrew, "He first (*οὗτος πρῶτος*) findeth his own brother Simon, and brought him to Jesus" (i. 41). It is thus implied that the other disciple too had an own brother, whom he brought to Jesus, as Andrew had done a little before. And hence it is plain that this disciple was one of the two sons of Zebedee, and not less plain that it was John, the younger brother, who alone survived even fifteen years after the death of Jesus.

In the account of the crucifixion we have a further proof, of the same indirect kind. For we there read that this disciple whom Jesus loved, and Simon Peter, went in to the palace of the high priest, to whom the former of them was previously known (St. John xviii. 15, 16). Now in the Book of Acts, only a few weeks later, when Peter and John are brought before the Sanhedrim, the high priest Annas and his companions "recognize them, that they had been with Jesus" (Acts iv. 13). There is every reason to suppose that the allusion is to the time, which would be fresh in their memory, when the disciple, who was known to the high priest, had introduced Peter to the hall during the eventful trial. And thus again it results that St. John was the writer of the gospel. And, indeed, since the author, if we exclude the supposition of forgery and wicked artifice, must have been one of the twelve, the choice is narrowed by this one fact alone. It could not be Simon, or Andrew,

or Philip, or Nathanael, or Thomas, or Judas, brother of James, all of whom are here mentioned expressly by name, nor yet St. Matthew, the writer of the first gospel. The two sons of Zebedee, and Simon Zelotes, are the only possible candidates for the honour. But James, the son of Zebedee, was martyred long before the gospel was written, and Simon Zelotes answers none of the conditions, which are all satisfied by John, the brother of James.

The writer, then, if honest and sincere, and not a conscious deceiver, must have been the beloved disciple, St. John, who was one of the earliest in his call at the first, and leaned at the Last Supper on the bosom of the Lord. Now, the gospel, amidst all its glorious exhibitions of heavenly truth, abounds in those delicate touches which vouch for its historic accuracy, and prove that the writer was indeed an eye-witness of the facts he records. How truthful, for instance, is the question of the two disciples, when Jesus had turned, and saw them following: "Rabbi (that is, Master), where dwellest thou?" How minute and familiar the reason for their stay with Jesus. "It was about the tenth hour." How simple and expressive the interview of Jesus with Nathanael, when the writer seems also to have been present—the change from sceptical doubt to wondering inquiry, and from wonder to hearty and childlike faith! How exact the notice, and yet how natural, in the marriage at Cana: "There were set there six water-pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece." How vivid the description of the whole scene! "They filled them up to the brim." "The governor of the feast called the bridegroom, and said unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now" (St. John ii. 1-11). In the cleansing of the temple, how distinct every part of the whole transaction, the expulsion of the cattle, the overthrow of the tables of the money-changers, and the rebuke in words to those in whom the profanation was less glaring and offensive! "And he said to them that sold doves, Take these things

2. It bears many traces of being the work of an eye-witness of the scenes described.

hence; make not my father's house a house of merchandize" (ii. 13-17). In the next chapter, how simple and real the notice that is given in passing, "John also was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there" (St. John iii. 23-25), and the account which follows of the strife between John's disciples and a Jew,¹ that is apparently a Pharisee, which occasioned the parting testimony of the Baptist to Jesus.

The history of the woman of Samaria (St. John iv. 1-42) abounds equally in these delicate touches of historical truth. The weariness of Jesus with his journey; the time, the sixth hour of the day; the posture, he sat upon the well; the place, the well which continues to this hour, and is still visited by Christian travellers; the remark of the woman, "Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep;" the mention of her five husbands, and her actual adultery or concubinage; the mingled evasion and confession, "Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet;" the surprise of the disciples on their return, because the Jews had no dealings with Samaritans; the haste of the woman in leaving her water-pot, that she may announce more quickly the presence of this wonderful stranger; the entreaty of the disciples, and the answer of Jesus, "I have meat to eat that ye know not of," with their perplexity, while yet unused to his deep, spiritual sayings, "Hath any man brought him aught to eat?" and the length of the stay, for two days, before he pursued his journey;—these are all so many tokens, in the words of the evangelist himself, that one who saw the scene has borne record, and that his record is true. Equally minute in its historical fidelity is the reply of the servants to the nobleman, when he inquired the hour at which his son began to amend, "Yesterday, at the seventh hour, the fever left him" (iv. 52).

The miracle at the pool of Bethesda (v. 1-18) has the same features of intimate and personal knowledge on the part of the evangelist. The description of its site, by the sheep-gate, and of its structure, "having five porches,"

¹ μετὰ Ἰουδαίου is the true reading.—ED.

the thirty-eight years during which the infirmity had lasted, the religious scruples of the Jews, the retirement of Jesus from the throng of people, the later interview in the temple, and the persevering malice of the Jews, are all portrayed with a simplicity that vouches for the truth of the narrative, and forms a beautiful contrast to the depth and fulness of the discourse which presently follows.

The account of the miracle of the loaves (chap. vi.) is still more striking for the clear signs of historical reality, which prepare the way for the heavenly discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum. These are the more observable, because this is the only event in our Lord's ministry before passion-week which is recorded in all the four gospels. The season of the event is mentioned by this evangelist only: "The passover, the feast of the Jews, was nigh." The immediate occasion of the miracle is also given, with a fresh particular of the scene: "Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples." In this gospel alone we have separate mention of the other apostles, besides Peter, James, and John, in their conversation with Jesus or with each other; while here Andrew, Philip, Nathanael, Thomas, and Judas have all of them one or more of their sayings put on record. In the present passage, Jesus inquires of Philip, "Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?" His answer, alluded to by St. Mark, without mentioning this apostle's name, is characteristically minute: "Two hundred penny-worth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little." The reason why Philip is thus appealed to comes to light from another passage of this gospel, which says that he was of Bethsaida, and from St. Luke's notice, that the scene of the miracle was "a desert place belonging to the city called Bethsaida." Again, the notice is doubly minute, both in the name of the speaker, and mention of the boy, and the description of the loaves: "Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him, There is a lad here, which hath five barley-loaves, and two small fishes, but what are they among so many?" It is a simple and natural statement which is made in passing, as from an eye-witness, "Now

there was much grass in the place : so the men sat down, in number about five thousand." We have then the fresh particulars, unnoticed by the other writers, that Jesus gave orders for the fragments to be preserved ; that the multitudes intended to take him by force and make him king ; that on this account, as well as for private worship, he retired from them into the mountain ; that they were only twenty-five or thirty furlongs from the land, rowing against a contrary wind, and with a high sea, when Jesus appeared to them ; that they received him into the ship with special joy, and that they were then carried at once and speedily to the opposite shore. Here alone we are told that no other vessel was there in the evening when the disciples launched, and that other boats from Tiberias came to the spot on the morning of the next day ; that the people lingered, in the hope of finding Jesus still on the eastern side, and that, upon their disappointment, many of them crossed over to Capernaum. The murmuring of the Jews in the synagogue, the withdrawal of many of the disciples, the inquiry put to the twelve apostles, the prompt reply of Peter, and the solemn allusion to the foreseen treachery of Judas, are all further proofs of that intense reality which marks the whole narrative, amidst the brightest and fullest blaze of heavenly truth.

When we pass on to the close of the gospel, the same character of minute knowledge, the knowledge of an eye-witness, reveals itself constantly by the most simple and convincing signs. We are thus told that it was six days before the Passover when Jesus came to Bethany, that Martha served at the supper which was made for him, and that Lazarus was one of the guests (xii. 1-11). The anointing is then recorded, but with minute and additional features ; that the woman was Mary, the sister of Lazarus ; that the feet were anointed, and not the head alone, as mentioned by the others ; that Mary wiped them with her hair, like the woman in Galilee ; and that the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. The complaint is given, with the supposed price of the ointment, as in St. Mark, but the remark is here only assigned to Judas the traitor ; and the

reason given for his complaint reveals another minute circumstance, that Judas carried the bag from which purchases were made for our Lord and his apostles. We are told, here only, that many Jews were present, and that one powerful motive which drew them was the presence of Lazarus; and that the disciples understood not at first the fulfilment of prophecy, in the ass's colt on which Jesus rode into Jerusalem. The incident respecting the Greeks is most natural, as well as minute, in all its details. They apply to the only apostle who has a purely Greek name. Philip consults Andrew, one of the four leading apostles, yet of whom nothing is said in the other gospels, and they jointly report the application of these Gentiles to Jesus (xii. 20-22). In the last supper, the whole incident with which it opens, in the washing of the disciples' feet, the warning of the treachery of Judas, the look of wonder and surprise in the disciples, the posture of St. John, the beckoning of Peter, the change of posture, to put the question more privately, the significant reply, the charge to Judas himself, the conjectures of the other disciples, have all an air of faithful and exact narrative, which brings its own convincing evidence of truth to any thoughtful and candid mind. The man must do violence to his own inward convictions who pretends to disbelieve the actual occurrence of the whole scene (xiii. 1-38). The same remark applies with equal force to chapters xviii. xix., with the whole account of the apprehension, trial, and crucifixion of the Lord Jesus. The prostration of the band of soldiers, the name of the high priest's servant whose ear was cut off, the charge to Peter, where Jesus alludes to his own prayer in the hour of agony, the fire of coals in the outer hall, the coldness of the night, the question by the kinsman of Malchus, the scruple of the priests about entering the judgment-hall, the Hebrew name of the pavement, where Pilate sat on his tribunal, *Gabbatha*, the hour of the public sentence, the complaint of the priests respecting the title, and the cold reply of the Roman governor, the seamless coat, and the lots cast for it by the four soldiers who crucified him, the sacred trust of the beloved disciple, the sponge filled with vinegar, and put on

hyssop, the breaking of the legs of the thieves, and the reason why Jesus was exempted from this indignity, with the piercing of his side by the spear, are all minute features in the narrative which attest its truth, and prove that the writer, as he states himself, was a real eye-witness of the sorrowful scene.

3. It throws light on the whole chronology.

This gospel, again, reveals its historical reality by the clear light which it throws on the whole chronology. We learn, here only, that a Passover took place between the close of the Temptation, and the return of Jesus to Galilee at the opening of his Galilean ministry (ii. 13); that a Passover was near at hand, when the five thousand were fed in the wilderness (vi. 11); that Jesus visited Jerusalem at the feasts of Tabernacles and of Dedication in the last year of his ministry (vii. 2-10, x. 22); and reached Bethany, in his last visit, six days before the Passover, at which he was crucified (xii. 1). And since it may be inferred, even from this gospel alone, and still more by comparison with St. Luke, that the feast, chapter v. 1, was a Passover also, the ministry of Jesus is thus fixed to a period of three full years. Again, the reply of the Jews to our Lord—"forty and six years hath this temple been building" (ii. 20), serves as a key, when compared with the history of Herod in Josephus, to the absolute date, and appears to fix A.D. 27 as the time of this first Passover. No gospel supplies so many important data towards the chronology of our Saviour's public ministry.

Again, the harmony with the other gospels, and the historical accuracy of its statements with regard to the scene of that ministry, is all the more striking, from the indirect manner in which it appears. The three earlier evangelists, it has been shown already, describe the ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and barely allude to his occasional visits to Jerusalem before the last public journey. St. John, on the other hand, with one exception, describes only the ministry in Judea. This fact has a general explanation in the supplementary character of the gospel. But the writer does not leave us without further links, to illustrate the connection between these occurrences in Judea, and the

main body of the gospel history, which had its scene in Galilee. It is in Galilee that he places the home of Jesus, and his first miracle; and the latest message to the disciples, which he records, is by the sea of Tiberias. Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Cana, all in Galilee, are noted by him, more distinctly than elsewhere, as the homes of the six leading apostles. When he describes the first visit to Jerusalem, and the ministry in Judea, he expressly notices that John was not yet cast into prison, and shows that the jealous dislike of the Pharisees made our Lord, soon after, transfer himself to Galilee (iii. 24, iv. 1-3). Having filled up the interval from the close of the temptation, through the first Passover, to this return from Judea to Cana, he suspends his task as historian, and ceases where the others have begun; but first explains why our Lord saw fit to choose Galilee, and not Judea, his birth-place, which seemed the more natural home of the Messiah, for the principal scene of his labours. "Now after two days he departed thence, and went into Galilee. For Jesus himself testified, that a prophet hath no honour in his own country" (St. John iv. 44). Judea was his own country, compared with despised Galilee, and Nazareth, compared with Capernaum and the rest of the province. He began his ministry, then, in Judea, but the envy of the Pharisees soon compelled him to return to Galilee. In Galilee he opened his public message in the synagogue of Nazareth, but their pride and passion made him soon transfer it to Capernaum. The apostle, by this new application of our Lord's own saying, not only implies the fact that his birth-place was Bethlehem in Judea, but gives the secret key, which explains the usual scene of his ministry, and the rare and occasional nature of those visits to Jerusalem, which occupy the chief part of his own gospel. In the same spirit, and clearly with the same meaning, after noticing that the Passover was at hand, when the miracle of the loaves took place, he continues his narrative. "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee (*περιεπάτει*), for he did not choose to walk in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him" (vii. 1). It is thus indirectly taught us that eighteen months, or one half the whole time

of his ministry, were passed without a single visit to Jerusalem. And hence, to mark the succession of events, and preserve the connection with the other gospels, one event in Galilee is recorded during this long interval, the miracle of the five thousand, which took place a little before the third Passover, and at a time when the men of Capernaum began to rival the unbelief of the dwellers in Jerusalem.

4. It shows familiarity with various localities.

The historical accuracy of the gospel is equally apparent, in its familiar allusions to the various localities of Palestine, and the different scenes of our Lord's ministry. The evangelist who soars highest in the contemplation of heavenly truth, is at home in the most minute details of local geography. We are told here, that Philip was of Bethsaida, from the city of Andrew and Peter, which appears to be a double notice that he was an actual resident at Bethsaida, but a native, or former inhabitant, of Capernaum. We have a passing hint, in the words of Nathanael, of the local discredit which attached to Nazareth amongst the neighbour towns. At the close of the gospel, Nathanael is said to be of Cana in Galilee, and here in its opening, the miracle at Cana is the next event after Nathanael's call to be a disciple. We are told that the first message to John was at Bethabara,¹ beyond Jordan, where he was then baptizing; and that, later in the season, when the summer drought might have begun, "he was baptizing at Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there." The well of Jacob is placed at Sychar in Samaria, "near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph" (iv. 5). The pool of Bethesda has its locality defined, and the number of its porches. The mountain, on the east of the sea of Tiberias, and the place of Capernaum on the opposite side, are joined with an intimation of the breadth of the lake, and the situation of Tiberias also on the western coast. The mount of Olives, the nightly resort of Jesus, the pool of Siloam, the porch of Solomon, the distance of Bethany, fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem, the position of Ephraim, on the edge of the wilderness, a description implying local

¹ The best MSS. have *Bethany*.

knowledge of the region to the south of Samaria, the brook Cedron, the garden of Gethsemane, the home of Annas, and the palace of Caiaphas, the hall of Judgment, the pavement, called Gabbatha, and the place of Crucifixion, called in Hebrew Golgotha, are all alluded to in the course of the history; and indicate a familiar knowledge on the part of the writer, which does not even suspect that the ignorance of readers might require any fuller explanation. When we compare the notices of place in St. Luke, the difference is very striking, and confirms the apostolic origin of the fourth gospel.

The various allusions to the apostles have the same air of perfect knowledge and unconscious truth. Their choice, and the list of their names, are nowhere recorded, as in the three other gospels; but the fact that twelve disciples were chosen, and the names of the greater portion, are assumed to be familiarly known. They are first mentioned by an indirect allusion, vi. 67-71: "Then said Jesus to the twelve, Will ye also go away? Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve? and one of you is a devil. He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for he it was that was about to betray him, being one of the twelve."

This, however, is only one out of many such marks of familiar knowledge. In this gospel only we find it mentioned, that Andrew first introduced Simon Peter to Jesus, and that Nathanael or Bartholomew was introduced by Philip; that the latter apostle lived at Bethsaida, and Nathanael at Cana; that our Saviour questioned Philip, before the miracle of the loaves, and Philip and Andrew separately replied to his inquiry; that the name of Iscariot's father was Simon; that Thomas the apostle was also surnamed Didymus, with his desponding words to his fellow-disciples before their return to Bethany; that the Greeks at the last Passover applied to Philip, and Philip to Andrew, and both of them to Jesus; that St. John, at the last supper, leaned on the bosom of the Lord, and

5. It is especially precise in its allusions to the apostolic company.

Simon Peter applied to him, privately, to learn the name of the traitor; that Judas carried the bag, in which the money of their necessary expenses was contained; that Simon Peter, Thomas, Philip, and Judas, the brother of James, took part successively in the discourse at the last supper; that Malchus was the name of the servant whose ear Peter cut off; that St. John was known to the high priest, and that Peter and John alone followed to the high priest's palace; that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was committed to the charge of St. John, as they stood gazing on the cross; that Mary Magdalene brought the first tidings of the stone being rolled away, to Peter and John, and that they ran together to the sepulchre, and saw that the body had disappeared; that Thomas was absent on the evening of the resurrection, and afterwards, on the Lord's day that followed, had his unbelief rebuked by a second appearance of Jesus, and uttered a full confession of his Divine glory. Last of all, that seven disciples were present, after the resurrection, at a second miraculous draught of fishes, and a third appearance of Jesus by the sea of Galilee; that Peter then received a thrice repeated commission, to feed the sheep of Christ, and a prediction of his own martyrdom; and St. John a mysterious promise of being spared much longer from death, until some special manifestation of his risen Lord in his glory. The details concerning the apostles, in all the three other evangelists, are hardly so numerous as in this one gospel alone.

6. It has frequent notices of number, time, and place.

This gospel, again, has frequent notices of number, time, and place, which give a more striking air of reality to the narrative. At the very opening, the events of six days are recorded in succession. On the first, the message of the Pharisees is sent to the Baptist; on the next, he bears public witness to the character of Jesus as the Son of God; on the third, he repeats his testimony in the presence of Andrew and John, who thereupon follow Jesus. On the fourth, he finds Philip, and converses with Nathanael, while setting out to Galilee. One day is spent in the journey, and on the third day from the one last mentioned there is the marriage at Cana. It was the tenth hour, on the third

of these six days, when the two disciples first abode with Jesus—as if the evangelist wished to fix the very moment, the day and the hour, which began his eventful intercourse with the Lord of glory. There were six water-pots at the wedding, and each of them held two or three firkins. The temple had been forty-six years in building, under the direction of Herod and his successors. It was the sixth hour when Jesus sat on the well of Jacob. The woman had had five husbands, besides the man with whom she was actually living. The stay of Jesus at Sychar lasted two days. It was at the seventh hour that the fever was cured, and this was the second of the miracles of Jesus. The pool of Bethesda had five porches, and the man who lay there had been afflicted thirty-eight years. It was a sabbath on which he was cured. There were just five barley-loaves and two small fishes, and twelve baskets were filled with the fragments. The disciples had rowed twenty-five or thirty furlongs, when Jesus overtook them, walking on the sea. The boats in which the people crossed the next day, came from Tiberias, and not to the very place of the miracle, but somewhere near it. It was at the middle of the feast of Tabernacles that Jesus went into the temple, and there taught; and on the last, the great day of the feast, that he made the striking appeal to the whole people, and the promise to all believers. The woman taken in adultery was brought to him early in the morning, and Jesus stooped down, and wrote on the ground, before his answer to her accusers. The eyes of the blind man were anointed with spittle and clay, before he was sent to wash in the pool of Siloam. At the feast of Dedication Jesus walked in the temple, in the porch of Solomon. After hearing of the illness of Lazarus, he abode two days where he was, and on his arrival at Bethany, the body had been four days in the grave. Bethany was fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem. The arrival there of Jesus was six days before the Passover. The ointment, with which Mary anointed Jesus, was valued at three hundred denarii. It was night, when Judas went out at the Paschal supper, and it was early, or before day-break, when Jesus was first brought

before Pilate. It was the day of the preparation, about the sixth hour, when Pilate brought him out to the Jews, with the words, "Behold your King." The garments were divided into four parts, one to each soldier. The spices which Nicodemus brought were "a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds in weight." The second appearance to the eleven disciples was eight days after the first, and each of them in the evening. There were seven disciples present at the third appearance by the sea of Tiberias. The ship was about two hundred cubits from the land when the draught was made, and the net enclosed one hundred and fifty-three great fishes. In all these minute particulars, we have the pen of one "who had companied with Jesus, all the time that he went out and came in among" his disciples, from the baptism of John until the day that he was taken up into heaven.

7. It bears a plainly supplementary relation to the three earlier evangelists.

Another feature of the whole narrative is its relation, as a supplement,¹ to passages in the other gospels. Events are not repeated, but simply alluded to, and fresh particulars indirectly supplied. No mention is found of the Nativity or miraculous Conception. Yet we read, more than once, of Mary, the mother of Jesus; while Joseph is spoken of as his father in popular esteem; but the evangelist himself forbears that title, which, on the contrary, he applies directly and exclusively to God. "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandize." "My Father worketh hitherto, and I also work." His birth at Bethlehem is equally implied, not only by the objection of the Jews, "But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem where David was?" (vii. 41, 42), but by the evangelist styling Judea

¹ Mr. Halcombe in his book, "The Historic Relation of the Gospels," maintains the theory that St. John was the earliest evangelist. I have only seen it as these pages were passing through the press. It is refreshing, in contrast with those who would place St. John late in the second century, to see how much may be said for a very early origin; but neither the external nor internal arguments of Mr. Halcombe have carried conviction to my mind.—ED.

“the own country” of Jesus (iv. 44). No mention is made of his baptism, but we have the Baptist himself bearing witness to the descent of the Spirit, which he saw at that time, and echoing the voice which proclaimed Jesus to be the beloved Son of God. His temptation is not recorded; but we see Jesus returning by way of Bethabara to Galilee, as if from the wilderness. No list is given of the twelve apostles; but we have the first introduction of Andrew and Peter, James and John, Philip and Nathanael, to their Lord, in the very order in which their pairs of names are placed in the other gospels. The term of reproach, Nazarene, is not mentioned, but its origin is seen in the question of Nathanael—“Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?” (i. 46). The actual imposition of the name Cephas or Peter, is not given at the ordination of the twelve, nor the confession which occasioned its repetition, but it appears as a predicted name on the first day when they met. “Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, Peter” (i. 42). Only eight are recorded out of all the numerous miracles of Jesus, and of these only two appear in the other gospels; but the first and second of all which he wrought are carefully given, before he began his public ministry in Galilee. The cleansing of the temple at the last Passover is not recorded; but a precisely similar event at the first Passover, three years earlier. We have no account of the charge made by the false witnesses (Mark xiv. 58), but meet, here only, with the saying which clearly gave birth to the accusation—“Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up” (ii. 19). We have no direct mention of John’s imprisonment, which preceded the ministry in Galilee; but are told that, while our Lord was in Judea, John was also baptizing, and was not yet cast into prison; which plainly implies that he was imprisoned very soon after. We have no direct introduction of the parable of the harvest field, as in St. Matthew and St. Mark, but only the passing statement, “Lift up your eyes and look on the fields, for they are white already to harvest” (iv. 35). We have neither, as in St. Matthew, a brief mention of his removal from Nazareth to Capernaum, nor an account, as in St. Luke,

of his rejection by the Nazarenes; since the narrative of St. John leaves him at Cana. But we have an allusion to the saying of our Lord on that very occasion in the synagogue of Nazareth, that "no prophet is accepted in his own country;" and the miracle wrought at Capernaum, while Jesus was still at Cana, is expressly placed the first in order, after the one wrought at the marriage feast; so that its previous occurrence will account for the request of the Nazarenes. The passing through the corn fields, just after the second Passover, and the repeated complaints of Sabbath-breaking then brought against Jesus, do not appear; but we have the miracle at the pool of Bethesda, in Jerusalem, during the feast itself, and the statement that it formed the date of a constant and malicious persecution from the rulers of the Jews. There is no formal and direct account of the deep interest awakened by the appearance of the Baptist, and the profound and universal impression made upon the Jews; but we have the passing statement, which includes the whole history in one figurative sentence: "He was a burning and a shining light, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light" (v. 35). We have only two or three references to the prophets, to confirm the claims of Jesus; but we find the comprehensive declaration—"Search the Scriptures, for it is they which testify of me" (v. 36). "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me" (v. 46). The ascension of our Lord is not reported in its place, but it is clearly intimated, both in the words to the Capernaïtes—"What if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?" (vi. 62), and in the message to Mary Magdalene—"I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God" (xx. 17). The appointment of the Lord's Supper is not mentioned; but the passage (vi. 51-58), is clearly alluded to in the very words of the institution in the other gospels. The confession of Peter on the way to Cæsarea is not given; but we have a similar confession, still earlier, after the miracle of the loaves, and the discourse at Capernaum (vi. 68, 69). No mention is found of the general expectation, before the final entrance to Jeru-

salem, that the kingdom of God, a temporal kingdom of Messiah, would immediately appear; but we are told that the multitudes, after being fed with the loaves in the wilderness, had intended to come by force, and make him king (vi. 15). We have no mention, as in St. Luke, of his resort to the Mount of Olives by night during Passion-week, but we find it named in the previous visit at the Feast of Tabernacles (viii. 1). The blasphemous charges against our Lord, that he was gluttonous and a winebibber, and that he cast out devils by Beelzebub, do not meet us here in the same form. But we find another, couched in the same spirit—"Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" (viii. 48), and a further allusion by our Lord himself to his mention of this very charge in the apostolic commission (Matt. x. 24). "Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his Lord" (John xv. 30). The incidents in St. Mark, where spittle was used in healing the deaf man in Decapolis, and the blind man at Bethsaida, do not appear, but the very same circumstance is here recorded, in the cure of the man who had been blind from his birth (ix. 6). The language in which our Lord announces his own purpose to raise Lazarus exactly answers to the phrase in the three other gospels, before the resurrection of the ruler's daughter—"The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth." "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go to raise him out of sleep" (xi. 11). The retirement to Ephraim, as shown before, links itself with the route, given by St. Luke, of the last public journey, preceded by a passage through Samaria; and the six days' interval from the arrival at Bethany to the crucifixion tallies completely with the accounts in the other gospels. The washing of the disciples' feet (chap. xiii.) explains the whole force of that remark by which the dispute at the last supper, as St. Luke informs us, was stilled. "Whether is greater, he that serveth, or he that sitteth at meat? but I am among you as he that serveth" (St. Luke xxii. 27). The answer of Jesus to Peter in the garden, alludes to the words uttered in his hour of agony, of which St. John has no record (St. John xviii. 11)—"O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me,

except I drink it, thy will be done" (St. Matt. xxvi. 42). And, last of all, the miraculous draught after the resurrection (St. John xxi.) resembles closely the earlier miracle in St. Luke (St. Luke v.); while all the features of contrast between them have a deep spiritual significance, which confirms their reality, as two successive works of Divine power, and parables of the blessing about to rest on the labours of the apostles when they should enter fully on their great office as the fishers of men. The scene where it occurred, by the sea of Tiberias, is explained by the charge to the disciples in St. Matthew, that they should return into Galilee. The appearance came unexpectedly upon the seven disciples, while they were waiting for the larger gathering of their brethren; and it was followed by that fullest and most conspicuous manifestation, which our Lord had promised before his death, when five hundred brethren were present at once, on the mountain that Jesus had appointed, to receive a solemn commission from their risen Lord, before he ascended to the Father.

Concluding
summary.

Thus, with every step we take in the close examination of these Divine histories, new signs of truth and wisdom come forth perpetually to our view. If it was true of our blessed Lord, that "never man spake like this man" (vii. 46), the remark may be extended to these sacred memoirs of his life, that never was history written before like these histories. So simple in style, yet so profound; so unadorned in their heavenly beauty; so consistent and harmonious, even to repetition, in their grand outlines, and so rich in their multiplied diversities; they contain an evidence of truth and reality, which defies all the vain efforts of unbelieving minds. They are a treasury of wisdom and grace that is able to supply the deepest wants, and remedy the most grievous miseries, of a fallen world. Like the heavenly cherubim, each has its own peculiar character, and reveals a separate aspect in the love of Christ; but they all unite, as with a voice of thunder, in uttering the same invitation to sinners—"Come and see the grace and condescension of the Man of sorrows. Come and see the glory of the Son of God." Every humble heart will

respond to their invitation, and will say, like Simeon—"Mine eyes have seen thy salvation," or like the Samaritans of old—"We have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world" (iv. 42).

INDEX OF PRINCIPAL NAMES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

- Acts, Book of.
 Chronologically regular, 33.
 Chronology determined, 197 fg.
 Results, 232.
 Its sole author, Luke, 235-236.
 Date and place of writing, 237-239.
- Adam of St. Victor on the Gospels, 337.
- Ænon. Its site, 48.
- Alexander.
 At Ephesus, 245.
 Brother of Rufus, 277.
- Alford.
 Notice of *Horæ Evangelicæ*, v.
 List of views on order of Gospels, 49, n. 2.
 On language of Matthew, 323.
- Agrippa. (See Herod.)
- Ananias. His high-priesthood, 231.
- Antioch in Pisidia. Length of Paul's visit, 214.
- Antioch in Syria.
 Residence of Theophilus, 242.
 Residence of St. Luke, 249.
 The Book of Acts completed there, 249.
 Luke's gospel written there, 258.
- ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη*, 246.
- Apamea, the census at, 265.
- ἀπογραφή*. Meaning of term, 263 fg.
- Apostles. Their designations, 299.
- Aramaic gospel. (See Matthew.)
- Aretas. His power at Damascus, 208-210.
- Arrangement of events in Matthew and Mark, 14.

Ascension.

- Date of, 197, 198.
 St. Luke's accounts, 60, 61, 252.
- Athanasius on St. Mark, 269.
- Augustine. *De Consensu*, 3 n.
- Augustus. (See Emperors.)
- Azizus. Marriage with Drusilla, 222.

B.

- Babylon*, in 1st Peter, literal, 272.
- Baptism.
 Of John, 64.
 Of Jesus, 69.
- Bartimæus, 288.
- Baur, xxvi.
- Bethabara, or Bethany, beyond Jordan, 45.
- Bethany of Judea, 44, 47, 106.
- Bethsaida, 122, 123, 384.
- Birks.
Horæ Apostolicæ, 202 n.
 Right estimation of MSS. evidence, 189.
- Blunt. Scriptural coincidences, 44.
- Bretschneider on St. John, 373.
- Burrhus. His prefecture, 232.
- Burton. Chronology unsound, 211.

C.

- Cæsarea, 251, 280, 281.
- Caius (Caligula).
 Claim to Divine honours, 210.
 (See also Emperors.)
- Capernaum.
 Two descriptions, 74, 81.
 Two denunciations, 166.

Cave on Martyrdom of Stephen, 204.
 Census under Cyrenius, 263 fg.
 Centurions favourably noticed in Scripture, 281.
 Cherubic symbols, 337-341.
 Chronology.
 Importance, 189.
 Principles of investigation, 190.
 Writers studied, 193.
 Table of gospels, 193.
 Table of Acts, 232.
 Chrysostom on St. Mark's Gospel, 270.
 Claudius.
 Decree about Jews, 228.
 Events in his reign, 199, 209.
 Clement of Alexandria on date of gospels, 1 n., 269.
 Collection at Antioch a work of time, 213.
 Common sense of English critics, xxiv, xxv.
 Comparative analysis of gospels, 4.
 Conder. "Tent Life in Palestine," 45.
 Cosmas Indicopleustes on Gospels, 1, 293.
 Council at Jerusalem, its date, 216.
 Crucifixion, Day of, 193.
 Cumanus, 218-220, 263.
 Cyprus, 211, 214, 281.
 Cyrenius. His government and census, 263.

D.

Da Costa.
 His work commended, xxv.
 On the Demoniacs of Gadara, 113.
 On the Accounts of the Passion, 179.
 On the authorship of Mark, 269.
 Twofold apostolic witness of Mark, 351.
 Damascus. St. Paul's journey and escape, 207.
 Demoniacs of Gadara.
 Seeming discrepancy, 113.
 Frequently dumb, 163.

δευτεροπρώτῳ.

The word to be retained, 92.
 Its meaning, 93.
 Its bearing on chronology, 184-192.
 Dicæarchia. Name for Puteoli, 248.
διέρχομαι and *διοδεύω*, 214.
 Diodati on the language of Palestine, 312 n.
 Disputes concerning precedence, 36, 129, 130.
 Distinctive phraseology of Matthew and Mark, 28.
 Drusilla. Her age and marriages, 222.

E.

Edersheim, 39, 44, 47.
 Egyptian. Tumult under, 221.
 Ellicott. Historical Lectures, xxvii, 39, 337 n.
 Emperors, list of, 198.
 Ephraim, site of, 47.
ἐπίουσιος, 317.
 Epiphanius on language of Matthew, 326.
 Evangelists not mere copyists, viii, 62, 127 n.
ἐνθῆως characteristic of Mark, 354.
 Eusebius on language of Matthew, 312, 326.

F.

Feast.
 In Matthew's house, 19 fg., 21 n.
 In John v. 1, probably Passover, 184; why not specified as such, 190.
 Of Tabernacles (John vii.; cf. Luke ix. 51), 39.
 Of Dedication (John x. 21, 22; Luke x. 1-42), 42.
 Felix.
 Date of appointment, 216 fg.
 Date of removal, 220 fg.
 Festus. His government cut short by death, 223.

G.

- Gal. ii. 1. Its bearing on chronology, 201 fg.
 Galba. (See Emperors.)
 Galileans slain by Pilate, 263.
 Gallio. Appointment to Achaia, 229.
 Gaza, which is desert, 238.
 Gemini. Their consulate, 198.
 Genealogies, 58, 341, 365.
 Godet on St. Matthew, 349.
 Gospel. Use of the term, 255, 256, 298.
 Gospels.
 Complex resemblances, 63, 64.
 Theories of origin, 2, 3.
 Relative order, 49 n.
 Compared in detail to establish their relative order, 64-179.
 Infancy of Jesus, 58.
 Baptism of John, 64.
 Baptism of Jesus, 69.
 Temptation, 70.
 Opening Ministry, 73.
 Call of Apostles, 75.
 Dispossession at Capernaum, 80.
 Cures at Capernaum, 81.
 Cure of Leper, 84.
 Paralytic, 86.
 Call of Matthew, 88.
 Discourse at Feast, 89.
 Sabbath and Cornfields, 92.
 Withered Hand, 94.
 Healing and Ordination, 95.
 Sermon on Mount and Luke vi., 97.
 Centurion's Servant, 102.
 Message of Baptist, 103.
 Two Anointings, 105.
 Parables, 107.
 Storm, 108.
 Cure of Demoniacs, 110.
 Jairus' Daughter, 115.
 Visits to Nazareth, 119.
 Commission of Twelve, 119.
 Alarm of Herod, 120.
 Five Thousand, 121.
 Peter's Confession, 123.
 Transfiguration, 126.

- Gospels. Comparison (*continued*).
 Lunatic Boy and discourse following, 128.
 Last Journeyings, 132 fg.
 Ruler's Question, 174.
 Blind Man at Jericho, 176.
 Gifts in Treasury, 177.
 Story of Passion, 179 n.
 Resurrection and Ascension, 60.
 (See also Comparative Analysis.)
 Gospels. Relation to time and to eternity, 340.
 Governor. Use of the term by Matthew a proof of early date, 295.
 Governors of Judea after Pilate, 217.
 Greg. "Creed of Christendom," xxvi.
 Gregory Nazianzen, 327.
 Greswell.
 His "valuable dissertations," xxv.
 On term *καθεξής*, 33.
 Mistaken in his views, 20, 177, 199.
 Griesbach on St. Mark, 50.

H.

- Hæckel, xxvii.
 Halcombe. Historic Relation of the Gospels, 388 n.
 Herod the Great. His death, B.C. 3, 198.
 Herod Antipas.
 His message, 46.
 His alarm, 120.
 His banishment, 200, 210.
 Herod Agrippa I., died A.D. 44, 199.
 Herod Agrippa II., 221, 222, 231.
 Herod King of Chalcis, died A.D. 48, 217.
 Herodians, meaning of term, 306.
 Home life. Luke's gospel gives its prominence, 364.
 Hug on language of Matthew's Gospel, 312.
 Hymns in the gospel of Luke, 364.

I.

Infancy of Jesus, 58, 172, 364.

Irenæus, 1, 2, 293, 325, 338.

Isidore, 2, 293.

J.

James, son of Zebedee, 301.

James the less, 286.

Jarvis, 197, 199.

Jason, 245.

Jericho, blind men at, 176.

Jerome, 2, 269, 326.

Jerusalem.

Mark's home, 286, 287.

Titles of honour in Matthew, 300.

Its dialect, 334.

Jesus. Use of the name in gospels, 167.

John.

Mention of name, 301.

Tradition of his immortality, 318.

John. His gospel.

Its historical relations to Synop-
tists, 180-187.

Internal testimony to its author-
ship, 374.

Work of eye-witness, 377.

A guide to the chronology, 382.

Shows local knowledge, 384.

Allusions to apostles, 386.

Precise in details, 388.

Its supplementary relations, 180,
388.

Gives the Judean ministry, 181,
334.

Joseph, husband of Mary. His pro-
minence in Matthew, 343.

Joseph of Arimathea, 287.

Josephus. His age, and voyage to
Jerusalem, 221, 222.

Jude. His various names, 302.

K.

καθεξῆς, 33.

κανανιτης, 302.

κεντυρίων, 277, 285.

κωμοπόλεις, 278.

L.

Lactantius, 198 n.

Lardner on oral tradition theory, 3.

Language of Palestine in time of
Christ, 312.

Latinisms of Mark's gospel, 276.

Lightfoot.

On Acts xxviii., 16, 232 n.

On date of Galatians, 233 n.

Lord's Prayer, 160.

Luke.

Companion of Paul, and author
of gospel and Acts, 235.

The brother whose praise is in
the gospel, 254.

Associated with Mark in N. T.,
283.

Luke. His gospel.

Its regularity maintained, 31-48.

Its relative date, 49.

Composed some time before the
Acts, 252.

Quoted, 1 Tim. v., 253.

Referred to, 2 Cor. viii., 254.

Written at Antioch, A.D. 51,
258, 259.

Spread abroad from Philippi, 260.
Peculiar Section.

Its harmony with other gospels,
38 fg.

Parallels with Matthew, 132 fg.

Not unaccountable, 158.

Distinctness of the similar events,
160, 161.

Cherubic symbol, 340, 341.

The gospel of Christ's human
sympathies, 363 fg.

M.

Macbride. Lectures on Diatessa-
ron, xxvii.

Macknight. "Harmony," 54.

Maclellan. "New Testament,"
xxvii.

Manaen at Antioch, 262.

Mark. The Evangelist.

His Roman name, 280, 281.

Connection with Peter, 67, 285.

The John Mark of the Acts, 270.

- Mark. The Evangelist (*continued*).
 His history, 271.
 His failure parallel to Peter's, 284-288.
 Personal links with Luke, 283.
- Mark. His gospel.
 Alleged Roman origin, 276-282.
 Probably written at Cæsarea, A.D. 43, 282-288.
 Cherubic symbol (the ox), 352.
 Gospel of action, 353.
 Gospel of detail, 354 fg.
 Distinctive miracles and incidents, 358.
 Closing words, 361.
- Marsh on Origin of Gospels, 3.
- Marshall, Professor J. T., on Aramaic Gospel, 14 n.
- Mary and Martha, 44, 106.
- Mary the Virgin.
 More prominent in Luke, 363.
 Her genealogy, 58, 365.
- Matthew. The Apostle.
 His call, 88.
 Feast in his house, 19, 21 n.
 His modesty, 309, 310.
- Matthew. His Gospel.
 Traditions of its date, 293, 294.
 Internal marks of early authorship, 294 fg.
 The closing words, 308.
- Partial Irregularity.*
 Established as a fact, 14 fg.
 A proof of early date, 303.
 Its higher moral purpose, 347.
- Original Language.*
 Early tradition of Aramaic origin, 310, 311, 325-327.
 Division of opinion in modern times, 322, 323.
 Presumptions against Aramaic, 311 fg.
 Internal evidence against Aramaic, 314 fg.
 The old tradition admits of explanation, 333 fg.
 Apocryphal gospels, 335, 336.
 Cherubic symbol, 339, 341.
 Spiritual character, 341.
- Mill. Advocates oral tradition theory, 3.
- Miracles, the moral teaching of series in Matthew, 345.
- Miraculous Draught (Luke v.).
 Distinct from Call of Four, 75.
 Compared with John xxi., 187, 392.
- Missionary. St. Luke's the missionary gospel, 372.
- Mythical theory: not to be met half-way, xxiv-xxvi.
- N.
- Narcissus. The salutation of his household, 230.
- Neander on irregularity of Luke, 31.
- Nebuchadnezzar. Double date to his reign, 198.
- Negative critics, their want of unanimity, xxvi.
- Nero. (See Emperors.)
- Nicolas of Antioch, 243.
- Norton advocates oral tradition theory, 3.
- O.
- Olshausen.
 On Luke's irregularity, 32.
 His relations to Mark, 53.
- Origen.
 On St. Luke, 254.
 On language of Matthew, 312.
- ová*, 276, 277 n.
- P.
- Paley on Paul's visits to Jerusalem, 202.
- Pallas, brother of Felix, 220, 224.
- Pantænus on Aramaic Gospel, 325.
- Papias on Aramaic Matthew, 310, 311, 325, 333-335.
- Parables.
 Of the Kingdom (Matt.), 347.
 Of judgement (Matt.), 348.
 Domestic (Luke), 370.
 (See also Gospels.)

Paul.

- His visits to Jerusalem, 201.
- Date of conversion, 207.
- Escape from Damascus, 207 fg.
- Events to Council at Jerusalem, 211, 216.
- First missionary circuit, 214, 215.
- Events from Council to release from Rome, 227.
- Connection with Mark, 271, 272.
- Connection with Luke, 258-261.
- Date of his martyrdom, 233, 234.

Peter.

- Connection with Mark, 67, 285.
- His First Epistle.
- Its place of writing, 272, 273.
- Selection of Silas as its bearer, 273, 274.
- Its date, 275.

Petronius commissioned to enforce decree of Caius, 210.

Philip the Apostle.

- Connection with Bethsaida, 379.
- And with Capernaum, 384.

Philip the Evangelist, 281.

Philippi, a centre of gospel distribution, 260.

Physician. Our Lord described as such by Luke, 369.

Pilate. His deposition, 206. (See also Governor.)

Preface to St. Luke's gospel.

- Asserts its regularity, 32.
- Its probable reference to Matthew and Mark, 54-58.
- Accords with date assigned in this work to the gospel, 261.

Prophecies.

- Matthew's quotations a mark of early origin, 305.
- Their frequency, 342.

Prophet. Without honour in his own country, 383.

πρῶτος. Grammatical construction, 266.

Puteoli, 248.

Q.

Quotations in Matthew show no trace of Aramaic gospel, 316.

R.

Rénan. "Antichrist" and "Evangelis," xxvii.

Resemblances of Matthew and Mark, 22.

Revised Version. Its use in present volume, 23.

Roberts on language of Matthew, 312 n., 324.

Robinson on irregularity of Gospels, 32.

Roman character, 352, 353.

Rubellius and Rufius, 198.

Rufus, 277.

Rushbrooke. "Synopticon," 30 n.

S.

Salmon.

On origin of Gospels, x, 50 n.

On independence of Matthew and Luke, 169.

On languages, 333 n.

On apocryphal Matthew, 333.

Cherubic Symbols, 339 n.

Salome, 286.

Schleiermacher on St. Luke, 31.

Schopenhauer, xxvii.

Scott on Cherubic Symbols, 339.

Selection of events in Matthew and Mark, 12.

Sermon on Mount.

Its authoritative character, 344.

Distinctness from St. Luke vi., 97 fg.

Distribution of verses in St. Luke, 169, 173.

Seventy.

Luke informed by them, 168.

Their mission, 43, 44.

Sicarii, 231.

Silvanus, 271, 273, 274.

Simon the Canaanite, 302.

Simon the leper, 302.

Simon the Cyrenian, 302.

Smith of Jordanhill on St. Luke's Gospel, 49, 50.

Social intercourse of Christ portrayed by Luke, 371.

Spencer. "First Principles," xxvii.

Stephen. Date of martyrdom, 204.

Strauss, v, xxiii, 50.

Suetonius on Jewish tumults, 229.

"Supernatural Religion," xxvii.

T.

Tacitus.

On government of Felix, 218.

On death of Pallas, 225.

On death of Burrhus, 232.

Tarsus. Length of Paul's stay, 203.

Temptation of our Lord, 70, 344, 365.

Theophilus, the high priest, 207.

Theophilus of St. Luke i., 239 fg.

Theophylact, 2, 266, 293.

Theories of gospel origin, 2, 3.

Tholuck advocates oral tradition theory, 3.

Thomson, Archbishop, on problem of gospels, 50 n.

Tiberius (see Emperors), 198, 203.

Tillemont on Stephen's martyrdom, 204.

Townson. "Discourses on Gospels," 3, 296, 298.

Tradition.

Oral, vii, xxvi, 3.

Concerning Aramaic gospel, 318, 328, 329.

Transfiguration. Seeming discrepancy in the accounts, 126, 127.

Transition character of Mark's gospel, 284.

Tregelles on Aramaic Matthew, 323, 327, 329.

U.

ὑπηρετής. Use of word, 57.

V.

Vitellius. His visits to Jerusalem, 205.

Vitringa on Cherubic Symbols, 339.

Voss on language of Palestine, 312.

W.

Watkins. Bampton Lectures, 373.

Westcott.

"Introduction to Gospels," vii, ix, xxvii.

Relative order of Synoptists, 50 n.

Length of our Lord's Ministry, 191.

Aramaic Matthew, 314 n.

Relation of the gospels to forms of heresy, 340 n.

Wieseler. "Synopsis," 38, 39, 47.

Witnesses, law of, applied to gospels, 180.

Women. Christ's dealings with them noticed by St. Luke, 369.

Worker. Our Lord described as such by Mark, 352.

Worshipper. Our Lord described as such by Luke, 367-369.

Z.

Zebedee. Mentions of his name in gospels, 301.

ζηλωτής, 302.

Zumpt on the census, 268.

Repaired by
Bob Armstrong
December 2010



THE MASTER'S COLLEGE

226 B536h

MAIN

Birks, T. R./Hor evangelic : or, The int



3 3540 00002 2075